THE NEW STUDENT

Vol. 8, No. 5 FEBRUARY, 1929 Price, 15 Cents

Science and Her Spokesmen
By T. SWANN HARDING

Business Goes to School
By BURNHAM P. BECKWITH

In the Roving Line
By SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE

An Enduring Basis for Peace
By OSCAR JASZI

Contents

THE MONTH 2

AN ENDURING BASIS FOR PEACE
By Oscar Jaszi 4

BUSINESS GOES TO SCHOOL
By Burnham P. Beckwith 5

SCIENCE AND HER SPOKESMEN
By T. Swann Harding 8

IN THE ROVING LINE
By Suzanne La Follette 10

A NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS
By Maurine Boie 13

THE HARVARD READING PERIODS
By A. Lawrence Lowell 14

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE WORLD 16

A RECENT GAIN IN CRITICISM
By Newton Arvin 19

MORE NOTES ON FREEDOM
By Felix Cohen 21

Contributors

T. Swann Harding is a physiological chemist, a contributor to various purely scientific and medical periodicals and to many popular magazines and publicatons, as well as to the following books—*American Medicine and the People's Health, Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for* 1927, *Fundamentals of Dairy Science.*

Oscar Jaszi is a member of the politcal scence department at Oberln College. He was formerly a Minister of Education in the Karolyi cabinet of Hungary.

Burnham P. Beckwith spent two years at the Harvard School of Business Administration.

Maurine Boie is a recent graduate of the University of Minnesota. While an undergraduate she was a member of the group which published *The Midwest Student*, one of the most notable of student magazines of this generation.

F. McCracken Fisher studied at Michigan State College. He is now assisting Mr. Upton Close in organizing the second tour to the Orient.

The New Student does not necessarily endorse all the articles appearing under the signature of an author and accepts responsibility for editorial opinions only.

Editor, Norman Studer. *Business Manager*, Mildred Meyer. *Contributing Editors*, Suzanne La Follette, Newton Arvin, Douglas P. Haskell, Sol Abramson, Kenneth Porter, Sol Auerbach, Paul Porter. Published by *The New Student*, 2929 Broadway, New York, monthly during the college year. Subscription for one year $1.00; Foreign Countries, $1.50. Single copies, 15 cents. Entered as second-class matter April 30, 1922, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The Month

THE outstanding event of the past month was the announcement of another epoch-making discovery by Professor Albert Einstein. According to press-dispatches, Professor Einstein has bridged the gap which has hitherto existed, in scientific knowledge, between the mathematical laws of gravitation and those of electro-dynamics. His new work brings those laws into consonance and enables their treatment from the same standpoint. The new theory has not yet been published, but when it is, its five pages will in all probability give rise to an experimentation and a literature as extensive as that which followed the publication of the three-page statement of his theory of relativity. To the lay-mind, the new theory will no doubt seem rather special and incomprehensible, like the first. But one need be no more than a layman to experience a sense of awe in contemplating a great mind "voyaging through strange seas of thought alone." The respect inspired by a genius such as Professor Einstein's enlarges one's sense of the dignity of the human spirit. For the layman this will probably be the greatest and for years to come perhaps the only value of his work. Yet its results may eventually prove of practical importance even to the layman. According to one American commentator, the new theory may prepare the way for a discovery of means of overcoming the force of gravitation. If that should happen, its effect upon human life might outdistance the longest flights of the imagination.

* * *

Infinitely less important than Professor Einstein's discovery, although the papers have given it much more space, is the ratification of the Kellogg treaty by the United States Senate. The action was popular. All the pacifists, fair-weather and otherwise, were vociferously in favor of ratification. No word exercises so hypnotic an influence as the word "peace"—save one, the word "war." The treaty's supporters, in the Senate and out, accepted the Government's assurance that the constructions put upon the treaty by other signatories do not affect it in any way, with the same blind faith that they will give to its statement, when the next war comes, that our enemies have violated their treaty-obligations. That inevitable "violation" of the anti-war treaty will make a magnificent piece of propaganda the next time our Government is looking for popular pretexts for war.

* * *

The next war, according to a German secret document recently printed in the English *Review of Reviews*, will involve a grouping of Powers around England and France on the one side and the United States on the other. This document, whose authenticity has been admitted by the German Government, is a secret memorandum by the German Minister of Defense, General Groener, defending his plan to build four new armored cruisers. The General sees danger to Germany from two sources: the armed conflict between the groups of Powers mentioned above; and attempts by other Powers, especially Poland, to wrest territory from Germany. The Reich, says its Defense Minister, must be prepared against these dangers. It must be able to defend its territory against aggressors and to maintain its neutrality by force of arms in the forthcoming world war.

The publication of this memorandum so soon before the Conference on Reparations is rather generally considered embarrassing for the German Government, since it is taken to prove that Germany is neither so poor nor so peace-loving as it would have the other Powers believe. Its effect may not be entirely unfortunate for Germany, however. It may be rather salutary for the Allied and Associated Governments to know that their victims have some spirit left. Victorious Governments are not prone to give much consideration to the hardships that their demands for indemnity may create for their defeated enemies, as the victors in the late war have amply proved during the last ten years. Nor are they so unrealistic as to be deceived by professions of peaceful sentiment; they know their kind too well for that. They can, however, very well understand a disposition to resist their demands. Germany may be in no position to fight out the question of

indemnities; but if it showed a will to resist an indefinite extension of the obligations imposed upon it by the Treaty of Versailles, it is questionable whether, in the present state of international affairs, the victorious Powers would be inclined to resort to force; for there is reason to suspect that such an attempt might reveal a want of harmony among themselves and a considerable amount of disaffection among their peoples.

For ten years now the German Government has been making annual payments to its late enemies under a treaty which postulates sole German responsibility for the World War. The researches of scholars in the various countries involved have proved that this claim of German responsibility is a myth created by the Allied and Associated Governments for purposes of propaganda. The diplomatic documents of the period preceding the war prove that the Governments of Russia, France, and England were quite as active as the Central Powers in precipitating the conflict. Since this is the history of the matter, the collection of indemnities has no better justification than the old saying "To the victor belong the spoils." It is interesting in this connection to note that the Agent General of Reparations, Mr. Parker Gilbert, although his recent statement concerning the economic condition of Germany indicates a belief that that country might continue indefinitely the payments required under the Dawes Plan, is reported as being in favor of a definite settlement of the amount still to be collected. Perhaps Mr. Gilbert is a little weary of acting as collector for a group of Governments whose tactics are distinguishable from those of a band of highwaymen only by the scale on which their operations are conducted. One could hardly blame him.

* * *

Turning from the international to the domestic scene, one notes that the naval program which has shared the attention of the Congress with the anti-war treaty, is still agitating the minds of legislators—and presumably those of armament-makers — and arousing much discussion in the press. If the expectations of the big-navy forces are realized, the bill for the construction of fifteen new cruisers will have passed the Senate before this issue goes to press. Our English brethren are watching the proceedings with rather thinly veiled apprehension. Sir Austen Chamberlain, for the British Government, has announced that England freely and willingly admits parity between the United States forces and its own—"an admission which we have never made to any other nation and which we should have made to no other nation." And an admission which is perhaps not so magnanimous as it would be if England were in a position to help herself. What the American people might do to help themselves in the matter if they were so disposed, is a different question. Articulate opinion among them indicates that they are prepared to swallow armaments and anti-war compacts in equal and simultaneous doses; a disposition which, considering that the one, as we have intimated above, will in due course be invoked to enforce the other, is perhaps as wise as any.

* * *

If law be ultimately definable as "what the people will obey," the Prohibition Amendment and the Volstead Act can perhaps hardly be said to have attained the dignity and prestige of law in a large portion of the United States. Many claims, perhaps justifiable ones, have been made for the beneficent effects of prohibition. But the fact remains that there seems to be no nation-wide disposition to obey the prohibition-law because it is law. Observation forces the conclusion that where it has been most effective in reducing the amount of drunkenness is in those sections and among those classes of the population where its evasion is most difficult. Some of the most eloquent arguments we have heard in favor of prohibition, honesty forces us to admit, have been made over the prepandial cocktail or the post-prandial liqueur in homes where by one means or another the rigors of the drought were somewhat mitigated. The principal conclusion to be drawn from American experience of prohibition appears to be that it is an excellent thing for someone else. Its chief victims are certainly not to be found among those who are its beneficiaries by force of circumstances. They are rather to be met with among those with whom ways and means of evading the law have come to take on the nature of an obsession. If our observation be good for anything, prohibition, much as it may have improved American morals, has had a most demoralizing effect upon American manners. It is not so much that those in a position to do so are drinking more and worse liquor than is good for them; it is that they think and talk so much about it. There are many reasons, no doubt, for that decline of conversation noted by Mr. Albert Jay Nock in his recent book of essays on American life; but not the least, one feels, is a rather disproportionate devotion of time and interest to exchanges of information concerning bootleggers, speakeasies, and formulas for making one's own.

All this is by way of preface to the remark that Congress seems disposed to see to it that Mr. Hoover shall be amply provided with the wherewithal to carry out his proposed enforcement of prohibition. Indeed, the Administration appears to have found the national legislature somewhat over-zealous in attempting to appropriate $24,000,000 to that purpose. Mr. Mellon addressed a letter of remonstrance to the legislators, and as we go to press it appears that Mr. Coolidge will veto the provision if it is sent to him. Mr. Coolidge no doubt feels, and with reason, that if Mr. Hoover wants $24,000,000 to spend on prohibition, he should take on the responsibility for the appropriaton as well as the expenditure of the money. Another news-item of interest in connection with prohibition is that the State Government of Michigan is moving to substitute a prison term of from seven and one-half to fifteen years for habitual violators of the prohibition law, for the life-imprisonment imposed on other habitual lawbreakers. One wonders whether this disposition to distinguish between violators of a sumptuary law and those who repeatedly commit murder, arson, assault, and burglary, is motivated more by an actual perception of the difference in the nature of the offense, or by a desire to avoid the strain that would be put on the State's finances and facilities, if it were called upon to provide accommodations for life to incorrigible purveyors of forbidden drinks. In either case it is commendable, and one hopes to see it translated into law.

SPECIAL
COMBINATION
OFFER

The New Student

(*Regular price, one dollar a year*)

and

Recent Gains In American Civilization

Edited by

KIRBY PAGE

(*Regular price, $3.00*)

Reviewed in This Issue

For $3.50

Please send *The New Student* and Recent Gains in American Civilization to:

Name .....

Address .....

THE NEW STUDENT
2929 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

8-5

An Enduring Basis for Peace

An Armistice Day Speech Delivered in the Oberlin Chapel

By Oscar Jaszi

IN TWO DAYS America will again commemorate her Armistice Day, the end of the terrible War and the victory of the Allies. It is a title of glory for the American people that this memorable day did not become in the public mind a chauvinistic and imperialistic symbol, but it was always interpreted in terms of securing peace and building up a new international world order based on good will.

When a few years ago I came to this country, I was deeply impressed by the intensity of the American feeling for peace. An attitude which old militaristic Europe cannot even understand, rather, it sees in it a kind of puritanic hypocrisy. Similar was the behavior of many political circles of Europe towards the Kellogg Peace Pact when, last August, Mr. Kellogg succeeded in imposing the outlawry doctrine of the best Americans upon the pessimistic and cynical statesmen of Europe. Again Europe did not understand America.

May I tell you some few words concerning this dangerous misunderstanding? As a member of our faculty has rightly emphasized before you some weeks ago, the Kellogg Peace Pact was really a step forward, in spite of many sarcastic critics of the European press. To give you only one example of this type of criticism, I will recall a satiric cartoon of a Fascist newspaper. Messrs. Briand, Stresemann, and Chamberlain are standing in the square of a big city. All three are pictured in a very gloomy mood. Menacing stormy clouds are gathering on the horizon. The air is becoming dark and sharp lightnings are cutting the heavens. . . . Finally one of the statesmen, I think M. Briand, asks Dr. Stresemann: . . . Well, have you not an umbrella? . . . To which the German diplomat replied in a hesitating voice: . . . Do you not remember that we just have outlawed rain. . . ?

Now the joke is not so good as it may seem. For a man who would know all the currents of the atmosphere and who would have a command over all the manifestations of energy, could "outlaw rain," that is, he would have an absolute control over it according to our human needs. He could, one might say, canalize rain according to the wants of our crops. . . . Unfortunately, however, the Fascist cartoonist was not entirely wrong, because exactly as rain will never be regulated by a simple announcement of some moral principle, so war will never be outlawed by simple contracts asserting some noble intention. Only by physical devices will man in the remote future control rain; only by the establishment of many social institutions of the right kind shall we be able after many heroic efforts to outlaw war.

That is what many ardent pacifists seem not to understand. The Kellogg Peace Pact is not a pact of Mr. Kellogg and the European diplomats (among whom we find such convinced pacifists as Duce Mussolini, Admiral Horthy, Dictator Pilsudski, the picturesque Ahmed Zogu, and many such sincere promoters of peace), but it is the will of the American people. This Pact could have two widely different effects: *it could work as a moral incentive or as a moral opiate.* It could induce public opinion to make concrete, resolute steps towards the realization of peace, or it could promote a false feeling of security, an effeminate indulgence in purely verbal formulas.

Here I see a grave danger, for American public opinion is very much inclined towards sentimental slogans. There is a widely prevalent American type, full of kindness and enthusiasm for peace, that is however a serious obstacle for peace because it regards with an angelic naivete the terrible flow of present-day events. These people enjoy the Kellogg Peace Pact as an opiate. . . .

When I was in Europe last summer I met an admirable representative of this type. She was a rich New York society lady and for a decade a champion of peace, who had an imposing peace record. She kindly confided to me the intimate statistical data of her amazing peace activity. I will not hide them from you. She attended 150 five o'clock teas, 133 garden parties, 376 lectures, and 44 congresses for peace. Just coming from Geneva she was exuberant with joy. "Oh, this darling M. Briand, how wonderful his speech was, and this staunch Lord Cushendun, how he devastated the arguments of the Soviet delegate, this naughy boy . . . and to all these miraculous achievements now comes the Kellogg Peace Pact. . . . I tell you, Professor," she said to me, "now our dreams are realized . . . we have really and definitely outlawed war. . . ."

I was cruel enough to disturb her joy. I alluded to the fact that in our glorious days, more soldiers are under arms than before the War; that instead of a disarmament there is a constant race among the powers in augmentation of their armies and navies; that in all the state laboratories of our peaceful great powers experiments are carried on with an incredible efficiency in the development of chemical and biological warfare; that the founders of the Kellogg Pact themselves asserted most energetically that their treaty has nothing to do with disarmament; that France assumed the role of the former Prussian militarism and Great Britain has proclaimed a new Monroe Doctrine concerning all her colonies all around the world.

Such and similar objections of mine had no effect on my enthusiastic apostle of peace: "Well, well," she said, "all these things demonstrate only that the governments are still dominated by an anachronistic spirit . . . but look at the peoples! How peaceful they are, how they hate war, how they are longing for peace. . . ."

In order to meet this argument, I advised her to continue her travel in middle and eastern Europe. I offered her a detailed itinerary and gave her a number of introductions to men who are in real touch with the popular movements. . . . After having finished her travel, very remote from the League of Nations, the dear lady wrote me a long letter which was not at all in harmony with her previous rosy optimism. . . . I can give you only a short summary of this interesting document.

In Germany she saw the exasperation of the Germans in the region of the Rhine, living under the dictatorship of foreign armies; she heard the war cries of the Nationalists against the Polish Corridor; she saw the continuous civil warfare in Austria, the outbursts of the Nationalistic and Socialistic volcano, the despair of a people that is impeded by armed force from joining the German fatherland; she heard the painful whispering of a southern Tyrolean peasantry suffering under the bludgeon of Mussolini; she witnessed the secret war preparations of feudal Hungary against the unjust treaty of Trianon; she looked on the hundred thousand exasperated Croat peasants who buried their popular leader, shot in the parliament at Belgrade, intent upon getting rid of the Serb supremacy; she regarded with horror the romantic land of the Albanian dictator full of the corpses of the hanged rebels; she crossed with a sore heart the Macedonian province covered with the victims of armed bands, paid by the neighboring governments; she was amazed at the new powerful Red militarism of Soviet Russia and by the new spirit of public education emphasizing the necessity of a future world war against the Capitalistic World. . . .

The opiate of the Kellogg Peace Pact no longer soothed the anguish of my poor pacifist . . . and yet she saw only the so-called European peace . . . she was not in Asia and in Africa to study the so-called Peace of the imperialistic powers full of slavery, slow starvation of millions and millions, and the continuous armed fights of wild tribes and military robbers. . . .

All these facts convinced my ardent pacifist and I hope shall convince you that you cannot outlaw war by the maintenance of the *status quo* which is often worse than war. . . . Because the God of the army and the God of famine and illiteracy is the same God. . . . What we need is not so much the Outlawry of War as the *Outlawry of Injustice*, of whatever kind or color it may be. . . . What we need is economic, national, and international reconstruction. . . . What we need is *a fit organization for social and international change*. . . . Give equal opportunities to all individuals, nations, and races. . . . Educate them to freedom, co-operation, and human dignity. . . . Destroy all artificial privileges, monopolies, and inequalities. . . . That is the Royal Road towards Peace, the only road towards a real Peace. . . .

Business Goes to School

Impressions of the Harvard School of Business Administration

By BURNHAM P. BECKWITH

When the Harvard School of Business Administration was given $5,000,000 several years ago it became evident that Business had begun a powerful drive to place itself on the level with law and medicine as a "respectable" profession. Other large bequests of similar nature have since been made elsewhere. This new manifestation in education is an important one, and the following article does not pretend to discuss all of its implications. Rather it offers raw material for such discussion in the form of impressions made by this education upon one of its students.

I CANNOT say just what reasoning impelled me to decide upon a two-year course at the Harvard Business School. After four years at Stanford I was still undecided as to just what I wanted to do. I had a more or less hazy idea that I wanted to be a business man, partly because four years in an academic atmosphere had given me an exaggerated impression of the financial rewards of business as compared with scholarship, and partly because I had acquired definite antipathies for law, medicine, engineering, and the ministry. Also I thought that two more years of education would be harmless and perhaps I would reach some more definite decision during that time. Consequently, during the last week of the September after graduation I was on hand for a course of preliminary lectures for first-year men at the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University. They were delivered in Emerson Hall, the home of the philosophy department of Harvard College, and certainly the lectures I attended there that winter brought an alien world into the classrooms where Santayana, Royce and William James had once lectured.

There were some four hundred of us first-year men in attendance at these lectures. The Business School practices as well as preaches mass production, since virtually all of my classes had a hundred to a hundred fifty members. Of these preliminary lectures I remember little except my first impressions of the students and the Dean.

The students immediately impressed me as being more capable and intelligent than the ordi-

nary run of college students. For the most part I found them hard workers and perhaps unduly impressed with the importance of high marks. Many of them believed their salary after graduation depended upon their grades in the Business School and this belief fostered thorough and painstaking, though perhaps not original work. To a Westerner the Business School men also appeared unusually well-dressed and self-confident. However, while the tone of the Business School is unmistakably set by Harvard, Yale, Williams and Dartmouth graduates, there are numerous Westerners there, some of the real "hayseed" type, as well as a fair contingent of young men speaking with a soft, drawling southern accent.

Dean Donham, I learned, had been a successful business man before coming to the Business School. He is not the typically hard-headed, dynamic, self-made business man who dominates American life, rather he represents a New England type of hereditary economic leadership. I understood, he had seven years of education at Harvard before venturing into business life and I can well imagine that his success was fairly well assured when he started. Dean Donham loves to deal in vague generalities about the vast importance of the business man in American life. In these preliminary lectures I heard him discuss at length his belief that a higher morality, a more willing spirit of co-operation, a new business scholarship, and a higher intellectual ability are steadily manifesting themselves in the American business world. And I could find no fault with his statements except that they were quite obviously true and at times almost platitudinous. The purpose of the Harvard Business School, according to Dean Donham, is to train men for the new profession of business. I shall say more later concerning the reverence for the word "profession" displayed at the Business School.

During the first half of my first year there, we Business School men lived in our own newly erected dormitories across the Charles River and attended classes in odd and usually far corners of the Yard. My work consisted of five prescribed courses, Finance, Marketing, Accounting, Statistics, and Management, each course meeting three times a week. Finance proved to be a course on when a bank should lend money and when it should not, with some sidelights on individual investment and corporation finance. When Professor Dewing, one of the intellectual giants, if not the giant of the school lectured, this course fascinated the entire class. When one of the numerous bright young assistants, and the Business School is overrun with them, had to lecture the class turned out to be boresome.

Marketing was a course in general principles of distribution from manufacturer through the wholesaler, through the retailer and on to the consumer. Statistics describes itself fairly well as does Accounting. Both courses though very practical and useful, were rather dull. Management turned out to be a course in manufacturing. It was so indefinite and superficial in its attempt to cover a very large field that it proved to be almost valueless. The most pitiful part of this course was the time given to discussion of personnel and labor problems. I well remember how the professor talked for a week about employee representation and kindred schemes without any one in the class realizing that he was actually discussing "company unionism." Nothing was ever said about that most important of all labor questions, the policy which numerous corporations have of discharging employees who devote their spare time to labor union activities. Much was said about the inefficiency of labor, when unemployment disappears, as it did during the World War, and little about the serious and increasing evils of chronic unemployment. As for the five-day week, the seven-hour day, higher wages or any other really fundamental need of labor, these were utterly ignored even though capitalists as potent as Henry Ford have already adopted some of them.

Perhaps the distinguishing characteristic of the Harvard Business School as opposed to other business schools is the use of the case method, first developed in the Harvard Law School. Each day we students read over a half dozen cases for each course, except Accounting, and were supposed to arrive at some conclusion on each one. These cases supposedly had been collected by the research staff and were therefore problems which business men had actually faced and settled. Of course there were no binding decisions to go by as there are in law courses but ordinarily our professors had some solution which they considered best. These cases might tell of a corner druggist who didn't know how to figure his markup or they might describe the financial condition of a billion dollar corporation and, ask us to solve the problem of whether they deserved a loan of a hundred million or not. I recall that the final examination in a course which I flunked consisted solely of the problem of how to raise a billion dollars of new capital for the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. When half a dozen such cases must be discussed in an hour's lecture, it is obvious that the treatment must be decidedly superficial. However, the sensation of dealing with actual business problems did much to maintain our interest in the work of the school. Moreover, merely reading over the details of these cases gave us a wide general knowledge of the customs and problems of various industries.

During the summer months between the two years of the course all students are supposed to demonstrate their fitness for a business life by working somewhere. Many of the men went home and worked in local concerns where family or social influence could easily obtain work for them. Large numbers also, by the same means, obtained temporary positions in large New York banks, brokerage houses, investment houses, department stores, and wholesale houses.

For the second year we all had to take two

so-called Business Policy courses but had our choice as to the other three. Thus we could major in Banking, Retailing, Statistics, Accounting, Advertising, Manufacturing, etc. Statistics and Accounting of course can be learned much better in a university than in business life and I believe that these departments turned out men probably better trained than the graduates of any other similar institution. Most of the men, however, chose to major in Banking, Manufacturing, or Retailing though I myself took a little of everything, except Manufacturing, which I mortally feared because of my experience with the first-year courses.

I believe the Harvard courses in Merchandising and Retailing achieve a greater success in their use of the case method, than any other courses given there. Their cases were usually more concrete and more practical, and the solutions more satisfying than those of other courses. We used David I. McNair's excellent case book and McNair had the class most of the time. McNair and Snyder of the statistical department were the two outstanding professors of that large group of younger men at the Business School. Professor McNair was the only man in the school who actually could cover six cases a day and "get them over" to the students in some detail. This course was principally devoted to problems of large department stores and chain store organizations. It emphasized the rapid consolidation of control over retailing in the hands of large aggregations of capital. It is one of the best courses given in the Business School because it is purely practical and contains little of the Rotarian philosophy that permeates so many.

Of the Business Policy courses one was composed of a half year of Economic History, decidedly pedantic and unreal, and a half year given to study of the Federal Reserve System, and stock and bond price movements. The other Business Policy course was a curious mixture of written reports on cases covering entire industries, Rubber, Air, Transportation, Fertilizer, etc. and an exposition of the philosophy of the Business School.

The philosophy of the Business School is the philosophy of the ordinary business man who is interested only in an immediate and practical solution of the problems of his own particular business. Thus the brilliant and able professors of the school will advise bankers to solve some of their problems by an advertising campaign urging people to save and the next day they will advise retailers to solve some of their problems by an expensive advertising campaign urging people to spend. Now such advice may be very helpful to individual business men but it is sadly defective when analyzed from the viewpoint of business as a whole instead of in particular. However, the chief purpose of the Business School is actually accomplished since its students who go forth and practice such teachings will actually make more money for themselves or their employers than less well-trained men.

During my last month at the Business School we listened to a series of closing lectures by Professor Cabot on the problem of whether business is or can become a profession. Of course Cabot and the rest of the Business School like to consider business a new profession because they feel that only professional men have ideals and codes of honor. And how they do long to be considered members of a real profession.

Actually, of course, this craving of modern business leaders and teachers to be considered a profession is merely the culmination in the slow rise of business from a despised and degraded plebian occupation to its present all-powerful position. For in spite of its present actual power, business is still more or less in the same social position as a noveau riche family from Cheyenne which has just bought a palace on Fifth Avenue. Business leaders now want to be considered aristocratic as well as powerful, learned as well as able, honorable as well as honest. And the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University is the leader in this new effort to make business a profession.

Of course there are other aspects of this phenomenon. A profession must put up bars to keep out the untrained, i. e. those unable to devote several thousand dollars and several years of their life to professional training. This latter result will be far the most important if the Business School is a success. For there are few sons of laboring men or office help, or store clerks studying anything at Harvard. And the tuition at the Business School is much higher than in any other graduate or undergraduate school at Harvard. Capitalists have many advantages in business already and the Harvard Business School, if successful, will give them one more very important advantage. If business becomes a profession then there will be nothing left for the common man except day labor. Perhaps this is inevitable, but if so, it makes even more necessary the completely socialized support of the higher institutions of learning and of students in or preparing for such institutions.

THE WORKERS EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE
Conducts
TWO COURSES of LECTURES
by HARRY WATON

I. **A COURSE ON UNIVERSAL LITERATURE**—Destiny speaks through literature as it functions through history. This course will teach how to interpret literature and to enjoy its beauties.
FRIDAYS 8 to 10 P. M. SINGLE LECTURE 50 CENTS

II. **A COURSE ON UNIVERSAL HISTORY**—In this course will be shown how destiny functions through history in one, continuous, rational, predetermined process.
SUNDAYS 3 to 5 P. M. SINGLE LECTURE 50 CENTS

Every lecture a classic by itself.

MANHATTAN TRADE SCHOOL
(Lecture Room) LEXINGTON AVE., Cor. 22nd St.

Science and Her Spokesmen

A Chemist Looks at the Barnes-Osborn Controversy

By T. SWANN HARDING

WHEN THE EDITOR of *The New Student* suggested that I write a brief article about the recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science I, as well as he, realized that much must be omitted and a concentration effected upon some important point. To tell the entire story would be impossible. The Association functioned through eighteen sections each of which was split into several societies and the bewildered registrant was handed a General Program of nearly three hundred pages, a veritable book. As a matter of fact no person could possibly attend all the meetings and lectures which interested him as an individual, as chronological overlapping proved absolutely unavoidable. The meeting was one of the quadrennial greater convocations held in New York, Chicago and Washington and it proved to be the greatest gathering of scientists the world has ever known. Fortunately for the purposes of this article there was a very definite focal point at which ideas most interesting to readers of *The New Student* were very highly concentrated.

For nearly twenty years I have been a research chemist. It has been my fate to attend many gatherings of scientists which in all too many cases evolved into mutual admiration societies and played "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." While the members sat in the corridors or in the rear of the lecture hall and got acquainted, papers were fired off with great regularity by stammering investigators who had no idea how to make their subject interesting, no voice to render it audible and no faintest conception of their own place in the great body of Science-as-a-whole. There were invariably so many papers and the time was so rigidly limited that discussion was impossible, while the possibility that some really general concept might be stated was remote indeed. The scientists usually proved to be timid little men of exceedingly limited curiosity, intensely solemn about their own narrow little specialty and intensely ignorant about and indifferent to anything outside that specialty.

At the American Association meetings there is some tendency to escape this monotonous exhibition of doctorial mediocrity for the speakers are more likely to be really big men. Furthermore there is a crying need for scientists capable of putting the scientific method to work in practical life and daring enough to see that until facts are rigidly faced in every sphere of human activity, and doctrines and dogmas are distrusted, civilization cannot get ahead very rapidly. It was therefore very unfortunate that the President of this Eighty-fifth Meeting of the Association was a celebrated compromiser with anachronism who lives in fear and trembling that some pinguid Bishop or some fatidical Fundamentalist may call him sharply to task. It was doubly unfortunate that in the face of such marked presidential caducity the only statement of the fundamental scientific viewpoint should have lacked objectivity and should have been made with such an apparent desire to be offensive that it lost its power almost entirely.

This brings us to what I, at least, think is the most important feature of the entire meeting from the standpoint of civilization. It just happened that, lured by such names as Welch and Barnes and Garrison and Cohen and Jastrow, I left my no doubt erudite but sadly inarticulate chemists and journeyed to the New York Academy of Medicine on the morning of December 29, 1928 to attend the joint session devoted to the Historical and Philological Sciences and to the Medical Sciences. The genial and very charming Dr. William H. Welch of Baltimore presided and, after warning all speakers that the thirty-minute rule must be rigidly kept, he reminisced for fifty minutes on the past of medical history with occasional deviations into the future.

At the end of Dr. Welch's inoffensive discourse Professor Harry E. Barnes arose ostensibly to speak thirty minutes upon "Science Versus Religion as a Guide to Life." Actually he displayed a knowledge of psychology as deficient as that imputed to the German War Lords and spent over an hour casting hand grenades of biting sarcasm among the quivering bodies of those present, with occasional brief intermissions between sentences to glance around complacently at the slaughter and to make faces at the maimed. Basically Dr. Barnes's message was the vastly needed one that more secularism and less anachronistic supernaturalism is needed in practical life; but instead of approaching his subject with philosophic objectivity and letting facts speak, as they well might, for themselves, he tore a leaf from the organs of fundamentalist atheism and began grinding his hobnailed boots ruthlessly in the face of an already prostrate and quite respectably deceased Jahveh. The result was that instead of bringing to the assembled savants a profound realization of their duty to further the application of scientific method to the problems of practical life, Professor Barnes gave rather an unimpressive impersonation of an immaculately attired smart boy of ten thumbing his nose at the Pope on the steps of an Episcopalian Cathedral. He not only had the wrong method; he had the wrong crowd. His address, which would have been a knockout before the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, was merely Mr. Mencken revealed (and how!) to his hearers.

The reaction was obvious. The next speaker was Lt. Col. F. H. Garrison of the Army Medical Library in Washington and perhaps the foremost living medical historian. He prefaced his prepared address by the remark that he could not subscribe to all these smart theories of the "newer intellectuals," and that so far as he was concerned religion was a matter of profound indifference to him, Dr. Kelly's (of Baltimore) vigorous efforts to convert him to the contrary notwithstanding. Thereafter Professor Morris R. Cohen lifted the discussion back to the high plane of esoteric philosophy and Professor Joseph Jastrow then blew aside the remaining clouds with his good humor and common sense.

Outside the chamber of the New York Academy of Medicine, however, the repercussion was considerable and, from the standpoint of Professor Osborn's carefully laid plans, dolent in the extreme. For the dear Professor President has repeatedly stated that science and religion cannot be in conflict and, having repeated his statement more than three times, it was so nearly true that he at least had the New York clergy believing it to the extent that they promised to devote their Sunday sermons to pious and uplifting eulogies of Science. Professor Barnes's bomb, however, made it so savagely evident that there was conflict that many of the reverend clergy turned upon Science and had at it so fiercely as to send President Osborn to his bombproof cellar for more arguments.

He came forth on the morrow with the contention that Barnes was out of order in injecting a metaphysical argument into a scientific session, quite regardless of the fact that he himself injects metaphysics into science every time he states, as he repeatedly does, that true science and true religion cannot conflict. Professor Barnes replied that he had a perfect right to discuss the subject of secularism versus supernaturalism at the Saturday session, and to recommend the former and, moreover, it is true that he did have that right and was perfectly within justifiable limitations. The point that both overlooked was a complete lack of taste and deficiency in psychology on the part of an expert in the social sciences, which robbed him of the opportunity to accomplish a vast amount of good by leading him to permit his address to degenerate to the character of professional atheism. His manner added insult to injury and somehow made the veriest truth he uttered evoke in the hearer a desire to oppose and rebel against the speaker. I speak advisedly here for I am personally at least ten times as skeptical as Professor Barnes, yet his dogmatism has rather irked even me.

This incident, however, has tremendous importance. After long generations of life on this planet man has evolved Science—a calm, impersonal, objective method of ascertaining the facts, of connecting these facts together into pragmatically useful hypotheses and of using this newer realism to solve the myriad problems which beset him. This new system of things has grown up in and gradually been superimposed upon a much older system—that of evolving authoritarian dogmas upon a paucity of factual evidence, using supernaturalism and superstition to buttress and to lend power to these dogmas and living thereby often in open enmity with the facts. There is little doubt that the newer method is not only more useful to man; it is more nearly true and therefore more sublime and more moral.

In spite of this fact the American Association for the Advancement of Science meets in its great concourse in New York City in December, 1928 and its President, and presumably its leaders, are basically so much beholden to that second and anachronistic system in the paragraph above that they no more dare offend its representatives, the clergy, than did Galileo dare to offend the Pope. This is remarkable. In view of the menace of anti-vivisectionists, anti-vaccinationists, anti-evolutionists and straight Bible fundamentalists it is alarming. Scientists need to be called to attend this situation and to overcome their gulosity for clerical back-scratching, but the truth must be stated to them with sufficient objectivity and finesse not to offend such a man as Garrison. Say what you please, it is just as important to know how to state truths as to have the courage to blurt them out so offensively that nothing is accomplished.

A further question impends. To say that true science and true religion do not conflict is, as Professor Leuba has admirably brought out, to say nothing. You are in that case discussing private metaphysical abstractions which have no practical application or reality in the manner that a laboratory of biology or a Roman Catholic Church or Dr. Straton has reality. Such metaphysical concepts of course do not conflict if it is your pleasure in synthesizing them to say that they do not conflict. But the scientist has to face the practical fact that the politicians and the churchmen of a state may unite together and stay the hand of research by enacting a law which deliberately forbids him to teach or to enlarge the truth. That is an actual condition in reality which must be faced and the only possible way to face it is effectively to oppose the forces which seek to defend and to spread nescience.

Granting that there was much in Professor Barnes's smart *American Mercury* manner to offend Lt. Col. Garrison, the Colonel's bombproof cellar labeled "indifference" will not do either. For he made the old argument that science has nothing to do with religion. I am quite willing to agree that it has nothing whatever to do with the metaphysical abstraction mentioned above and stated with all the pleonastically sesquipedalian valetudinarianism with which any compromiser can equip it. But when it comes to actuality science does have a right to examine religion. It has a duty to dissect it. Why not?

The essence of religion is the intuitive revela-

tion vouchsafed the mystics in trance. That revelation, whether it can be explained or not, has an inviolable validity none dare question. That is religion at its best and upon what does it depend? It depends altogether upon sensations and feelings within the province of the science of psychology. It depends upon precisely those states of mind which the morbid psychologist studies when the subject is under the influence of some drug, is in a trance state, is hypnotized or is in a state of near coma. Science has a perfect right to examine these states just as Leuba has in his *Psychology of Religious Mysticism.*

Finally come to your normal, average citizen who believes quite objectively (and non-mystically) in God or in immortality. Ask him upon what his belief depends and you will find that in every single case he describes to you emotions or states of feeling which you yourself have had but have probably interpreted far otherwise. Science again has a perfect right to carry on investigations here nor should it be indifferent. It dare not be indifferent so long as its massed gatherings are presided over by an element which feels that it must propitiate the vested guardians of supernaturalism and of refined superstition.

Thus once more the usual array of little facts was presented in the various sessions of the Association. Certain general conclusions of importance stood out somewhat conspicuously. New truths were born and new hypotheses given impetus. But over all was the pervading timidity which counsels compromise or indifference and the only effort made to call the attention of the Association to the matter of greatest importance was largely frustrated by ineptitude in its presentation. Yet that is fundamental. Until science gains respect for secularism; until it gains respect for pure, unindoctrinated facts, its voice cannot be heard in morals, in ethics, in social relations, in politics and in economics as it must be heard before civilization can be ushered in. Quietly, politely, objectively, philosophically but none the less firmly, science must take its stand and put supernaturalism on the defensive. Even at this day supernaturalism and not science should be called upon to do the placating, the equivocating and the compromising.

In the Roving Line

By SUZANNE LA FOLLETTE

FOR several years I have been following with interest the discussion, public and private, which has been stirred up by the frank departure of modern youth from the narrow ways of traditional sexual morality. I have heard this departure attributed to the natural perverseness of youth, the failure of parents, the increasing difficulty of marriage, the decline of religion and of the home, to demoralization caused by the war; in fact to almost every possible reason save one: that the traditional morality may not be precisely adapted to the conditions of modern life. Now and then a realist like Mr. V. F. Calverton dares to proclaim that the whole traditional system of marriage and sexual morality is bankrupt; or a sympathetic friend of youth like Judge Lindsey suggests (to the horror of those who think the proposed remedy worse than the disease) that our straying youth be brought safely within the pale of regulation through the companionate marriage; but for the most part those who are alarmed into articulateness by modern sexual unorthodoxy are as firmly resolved as Mrs. Petulengro not to sanctify anything in the roving line.

This attitude indicates, simply, that the minds of a great many people are not yet fitted to a change which comes as one of the natural and inescapable results of a revolutionized economic and social life. Because the moral code has the sanction of long usage, there is always a lag in its adjustment to fundamental changes in the collective life; nevertheless it is always eventually adjusted. No assumption is more erroneous than the assumption that there are absolute and divinely ordained categories of right and wrong. As Dr. Boas remarks in his *Anthropology and Modern Life,* these categories vary widely in different civilizations, and in different periods of the same civilization. The assumption, therefore, that the moral standards which our fathers found good must necessarily be good for their children or their children's children, is unrealistic to the point of absurdity.

The question to what extent sexual relations should come under the purview of morality is also one which is answered differently by different peoples and at different periods. In Christian civilization they have been considered so important a part of morality that one finds the word "morals" defined in the Oxford dictionary as having special reference to sexual conduct. The sexual life of women, especially, has been the most important category of the moral code. That code, the code which is now being lamented, was fitted, as moral codes invariably are, to economic conditions and the social conditions arising out of them. If its incidence was heaviest upon women, that was because women were until recently a subject sex, with the status of chattels. The moral code fitted that status very well. Its sanctions were devised to serve the purpose of regulating the sexual conduct of woman as the subject sex in the interest of man as the dominant sex. So long as women were economically

and legally subject to men, their own self-interest dictated acquiescence in this morality. But that was not all: the sense of sin which is almost universally associated with sex was quite naturally associated with any breach of the prevailing moral code; so that both women and men regarded any feminine violation of the code not only as a violation of masculine property- rights, but as an offense against God.

The sexual conduct of men came in quite a different category. As the dominant sex, men have been pretty generally exempt from the sanctions of Christian morality; which is to say that their sexual life has not been generally regarded as falling under the purview of morality at all, but rather under that of manners. They have been required to submit to a system of legalized monogamy, and theoretically they have been expected to be chaste. But since the terrible sanctions of female unchastity have not been invoked against unchastity in men, they have been under much less external compulsion than women to regulate their sexual life in at least apparent conformity with the prevailing notions of right and wrong in such matters.

This is only to say what everyone knows: that the traditional morality is a dual morality, which sets up one standard of conduct for men and another for women. If it tends to be disregarded by the youth of today, there are a number of contributory circumstances, no doubt: the disappearance of that sense of sin which superstition connects with sex; the increasing knowledge of methods of contraception; the growing difficulty of marriage and its decreasing desirability from an economic point of view; all these have their bearing on the situation. But although they would explain an increasing number of extra-legal sexual relations they would hardly explain the absence of effort at concealment. Since men have rarely been under any particular compulsion to conceal such affairs, the openness with which these tend to be conducted can indicate but one thing: a change in the attitude of woman toward the traditional taboos against her sex.

This, I think, is the most important phase of the subject. It indicates, on the part of the modern girl, not so much a repudiation as a quiet disregard of what used to be the most rigid criterion of her conduct: "what the neighbors will say." In this new sexual freedom there is, so far as I can see, neither the bitterness nor the bravado that one associates with revolt. The modern girl is reaping the rewards of the revolt of her forbears; she is sure enough of her freedom to be able to take it casually. Therefore she quietly takes, not demands, self-determination in her sexual relations, without even troubling to offer to the code the doubtful tribute of hypocrisy. She can do this because the economic sanctions of the code are no longer valid. Marriage may still be her chief vocation, statistically, but it is far from being the only one open to her. Since she is no longer entirely dependent upon man economically, she is under no compulsion to continue to be subject to him sexually. With this compulsion removed women can afford to disregard a moral code which emphasized their subjection; and in doing so, they remove their sexual conduct from the purview of morals to that of manners. It is a revolutionary step, but it is a logical and natural outcome of the revolution which has taken place in the economic and social position of women since the introduction of machinery converted the family from a producing to a consuming economic unit, and sent women out into the world to earn their living in competition with men.

This is perhaps not regrettable. Although most human societies undertake to prescribe and regulate the relation between the sexes, it would be difficult to sustain the thesis that this relation is legitimately the concern of a third party—and society, in attempting to regulate it, places itself in the position of a third party. However, the question is highly controversial, and not especially germane to this discussion. My present interest is in the fact—the breakdown of the traditional morality—and some of its implications. The first of these, as I have intimated above, is that the traditional morality no longer fits social conditions. Being based on the subjection of women, it was not only arbitrary and tyrannical, but it could bear no remote resemblance to any genuine ethic of sex. It offered men and women little inducement to sincerity in sexual relations, for it was calculated to breed arrogance in men and servility in women. Above all, as Robert Louis Stevenson remarked, it created almost insuperable difficulties for men and women, by providing boys and girls with entirely different sets of "catchwords" by which to regulate their sexual conduct. The conspicuous and often tragic disharmony between the sexes in this most delicate of relationships may not, of course, be entirely due to the difference in the traditional preparation of boys and girls for sexual experience. There are many who claim that its basis is more biological than psychological. But certainly this claim must remain in the category of undemonstrable assumptions until identical standards of conduct for boys and girls shall exclude the possibility of artificially created differences. And that the traditional morality was well calculated to produce such differences is hardly to be gainsaid.

It may be logically expected that the abandonment of a moral code which assumes inferiority in women will pave the way to a higher concept of the relation between the sexes. It is most desirable that men shall come to regard women as human beings equal with themselves, rather than as inferiors to be either preyed upon or protected; and it is equally desirable that women shall come to regard themselves as autonomous individuals, accountable only to themselves for their behavior. Above all, perhaps, it is desirable that neither sex shall regard either its own virture or that of the other sex as residing wholly or chiefly in ad-

herence to a conventional standard of sexual conduct. By quietly ignoring the traditional taboos against their sex and behaving as if their sexual life were their own affair, I venture to say that women of today are doing a great deal to create between the sexes the mutual respect without which there can be little sincerity in sexual relations.

There will be many to disagree with this statement; for there are a great many people who believe that women need protection in their sexual relations, and that the code offers them that protection. One hesitates to generalize in such a matter; but it seems safe to say that men in general seem to be somewhat less emancipated in their attitude towards sex than women are. This is natural, for they have not had to make any effort towards emancipation. Many of them, therefore, are still victims of the irresponsibility that the code encourages in men; they have not developed the self-discipline of freedom to the same extent, perhaps, as women. Such men are likely to show little sincerity in extra-legal sexual relations. There is no doubt of that. But they are also likely to be the very ones who will behave insincerely within the bonds of wedlock; and the difference between the plight of the unmarried woman who has been victimized by such a man, and that of the lawful wife to whom he has been unfaithful, is likely to consist in the fact that the former is not hurt quite so publicly, is not obliged to go through an expensive and humiliating divorce-proceeding in order to be free, and is much less likely to have children whose legitimate interests serve to complicate the question of her relation to her unfaithful lover. Against the real tragedy involved—the disappointment and disillusion—the traditional morality offers no more protection to the one than to the other.

If any of my readers be inclined to take this statement as an argument for extra-legal sexual relations, my answer is that it is not my present interest to argue this point, any more than it is to argue the question whether society shall undertake to prescribe and regulate the sexual relation. I am simply stating a rather obvious fact. Under the traditional morality, the chief objection to an extra-legal relation was that if it became known it did great damage to a woman's reputation and hence to her chances in the only career open to her. Once that sanction is removed, the question has to be considered from an entirely different point of view. If it is to be decided at all in a general way, it must then be on its merits: the value of extra-legal sexual relations to the individuals concerned.

There is one phase of the new sexual unorthodoxy which might be discouraging to the believer in freedom if one were not justified in regarding it as temporary. That is the tendency among young people to confound sexual freedom with sexual promiscuity, and to make of the latter a convention almost as tyrannical as the old convention of repression. The new convention shows no more spiritual freedom than the old, of course; and it is questionable whether it is psychologically less harmful. Its results are sometimes a bit startling. A friend of mine has lately told me of a pert young flapper of her acquaintance who boasted that she had had sexual relations with twenty-nine men. For those who like this sort of thing, of course, it is the sort of thing they like. One is inclined to suspect, however, that this young girl indulged what seems an inordinate preoccupation with the sheer mechanics of sex not so much because she liked it as because her set expected it. This is not only childish; it is disheveling. From the viewpoint of manners, such excess is no more admirable than the preoccupation with alcohol and over-indulgence in it which well-bred Europeans find so disgusting in many Americans. Self-indulgence is a sign of psychic immaturity, and as such it is unattractive to civilized people. There is a good deal of excellent testimony to the fact that no form of self-indulgence brings less spiritual return than a casually and promiscuously indulged sexual appetite. As Robert Burns said, "It hardens a' within and petrifies the feelin'." But no more so in women, of course, than in men. Sexual promiscuity only seems more disgusting and dangerous (or ludicrous) in women, because it is a mode of conduct to which the world is less accustomed in women than in men.

What one naturally hopes for in both girls and boys, is the courage of individualism, and the self-knowledge and self-discipline of individualism. To do a thing, not because it is expected, but because it is in accordance with one's nature; this is the desirable mode of life. There is as much danger to the individual in yielding to an expected want of self-discipline as in yielding to an expected self-repression. Each surrender betokens a weakness of will and judgment. It is a departure from the normal course of one's own development; and it produces that spiritual discomfort which always results from living out of harmony with the laws of one's own being. Want of self-control is always disheveling—much more so than the actual behavior that it induces. "Toute chose dite immorale," says Faure, "ne ruine un peuple ou un individu que si le peuple s'affaiblit ou si l'individu s'énerve." And to yield one's individual preference to the expectation of the herd is enervating in the extreme.

The desirable thing in the relation between the sexes is sincerity; and that relation puts about as great a strain on sincerity as could be devised. There is no relation in which men and women are under greater temptation to deceive one another, for there is none, perhaps, in which desires come into such sharp conflict with ideals. There is none, therefore, in which sincerity requires a more rigid self-discipline. The traditional morality was of a kind to discourage rather than foster self-discipline, since it made woman responsible for her sexual conduct to anyone but herself and man responsible to no one. It speaks well for the essen-

tial goodness of human nature that our ancestors were able to do as well as they did in spite of the code. Indeed, the person who fears the new adjustment that is taking place at present may find comfort in being reminded that society has managed to hold together even under a most immoral code, and that a great many people have been able, in spite of that code, to develop a fine sense of manners and a noble sincerity of conduct. If men and women can do so well in spite of moral inducement to do badly, there can be little reason to be apprehensive of any general demoralization from the mere freedom to choose whether they shall do well or ill.

A National Student Conference

By MAURINE BOIE

THE fads and follies of the collegiate youngsters, successfully exploited by a sensation-hunting press and a bewildered and resentful older generation, have set before the public mind a ridiculous stereotyped figure labelled "student." It is as unsatisfactory and untrue a picture as that older caricature of a pale, undersized, spectacled, unsocial grind. Neither fits the case of that considerable-sized body of intelligent students who lead the thinking of the college world, but both have challenged and necessitated the defense and true representation of this more serious element in the student body. A proportion, at least, of the victims of the modern educational machine insist that they shall know what is happening to them, and that they not be shuttled back and forth blindly, from class to class and activity to activity, without some explanation of the traditions that sanction the curriculum, the methods of instruction, and the teacher-student relationship in our colleges and universities. This critical state of mind in college youth, seeking to understand, evaluate, and contribute to its own education, has found a variety of expressions. It has sought escape in indifference; it has dulled its pangs with social activities; it has pacified its restlessness with student conferences of all sorts. Its more serious thinkers have sought expression through the few college papers extant that include constructive criticism as well as college humor, and of which *The New Student* is the finest example. Another expression of this same attitude among student leaders is the National Student Federation of America.

The Fourth Annual Congress of the National Student Federation of America met at the University of Missouri on December 12th to 15th. The theme for its meetings, the method of procedure, and the conclusions of its discussions are indicative of the character of this organization and the 400,000 students it represents. Conventions can be most futile things, inflated for the moment with a false and forced enthusiasm and fine phrases and resolutions that spring up like mushrooms but provide no solid diet for constructive thinking or work during the interval before the next convention. But the delegates to the N. S. F. A. Congress did not feel it was a futile thing nor did those outside observers who came to listen in. Yet there was nothing startling or dramatic about any of the discussions; the ideas of the student leaders of American colleges furnished no headline material, nor, it must be said, anything to stir apprehension among the powers that be. The Congress theme, "Quo Vadis," might have furnished the starting point for a great deal of needless hot air and impractical idealism. Its significance proved to be that it stimulated, not theorizing about the future, but rather self-criticism of organized student efforts, and particularly an evaluation of the purposes and possibilities of the N. S. F. A. The question resolved itself into a double challenge: not only where are we going, but how are we going to get there.

What was perhaps largely responsible for the success of the Congress was the fact that delegates came with definite problems that the students of their campuses wanted solved, and requests for concrete help from the N. S. F. A. It is now a well-established educational principle that children learn better when they are working on actual problems for which they see some purpose. So the results of this Congress suggest that student thinking is best stimulated when it is confronted by an actual problem, and that the vitalization of American student thought is best achieved, not by exhortation or ridicule, but from the challenge of situations needing improvement. A brief resumé of the discussions which were the chief life of the Congress will indicate the serious purpose and practical significance of this organization.

To the American student one of the most important phases of the college world is his own self-government. The development of activities on our campuses has reached an amazing number and complexity. In a recent discussion of the ideal college, Mr. Max McConn, Dean of Lehigh University, says that this development "reflects an incidental discredit on our college teachers and administrators; because the students have been compelled to work it out practically without assistance from the faculties. Most professors and deans and presidents have failed to understand the nature of these things or to interpret their significance, and so have been disposed—with the best motives in the world—to hinder and sabotage activities, by an ingenious variety of petty restrictions and penalties." On the self-determination and resourcefulness of students themselves rests the regulation of a large part of their social and intellectual activities. A consideration of these problems alone and an exchange of solutions would merit a three days' discussion as may be seen from a partial list of them, including the indifference of student bodies to the government of their college: the unequal representation of students, faculty, and alumni on governing bodies; compulsory chapel; freshmen orientation; smoking on women's campuses; student control over profit-making activities; college traditions; student salaries; the blanket tax; athletic and forensic awards.

This year a special discussion group considered the prevalence and effectiveness of the Honor System. James T. Jackson of Howard College, who recently prepared an exhaustive thesis on the subject, reported his survey of its use in American colleges. Approximately forty per cent of the colleges and universities of the United States now use one of the various forms of the honor system. The conclusion of the N. S. F. A. delegates was that this system was decidedly an asset to the educational world and that its advantages outweigh its disadvantages. The N. S. F. A. decided to encourage and aid in every possible way colleges and universities to improve their honor system if they have one. Where the honor system does not exist it was proposed to lend aid in helping establish it, by first building up the necessary traditions

by educational measures extending over a period of at least three years, group discussions, constant emphasis of the spirit of honor, and a definite limitation upon the system.

The fraternity and sorority systems were criticized for their self-sufficiency and artificial superiority. The consensus of the group was that, by and large, this system had won the right to continue existence because of the preponderance of beneficial influences over and above its destructive tendencies, but that there were a number of problems relative to this system that needed improvement. A commission of the N. S. F. A. was created for the consideration of certain proposed projects for the system, including rushing methods, "combines" of fraternities for political purposes within the college, initiatory observances, and ways by which fraternities may be of aid to the college administration.

A powerful force on most campuses is the college newspaper, and this, the discussion group felt, should attempt to mold undergraduate opinion along progressive lines rather than attempt only to reflect the existing opinion; it should not attempt to be a newspaper pure and simple but within limits it should lend itself as an instrument of propaganda for worthy campus activities. The independence of the younger generation here asserts itself in a determination to secure freedom of the press, believing that if the paper is to be an expression of undergraduate ideas faculty supervision must be reduced to a minimum if not eliminated altogether. The editor must be free to criticize the administration in a properly respectful manner when the occasion arises.

The question of compulsory R. O. T. C. work is a battleground in many of the member colleges of the N. S. F. A., and the discussion of this campus problem was heated and vigorous. Mr. Tucker Smith presented the arguments against militarism, and the officers of the local units refusing to meet Mr. Smith in discussion, an attorney and some of the delegates contributed to a real discussion of one of the major problems confronting an intelligent student body.

These suggestions of the sort of problem that really interests and challenges American students show the lines along which their thinking is leading them. The enthusiastic idealism that marked the first national mobilization of student thought in the National Student Federation of America formulated these principles upon which to work: "We would achieve a spirit of co-operation among the students of the United States to give consideration to questions affecting students' interests; we would develop an intelligent student opinion on questions of national and international importance; we would foster understanding among the students of the world in the furtherance of an enduring peace." The work of the Congresses, the N. S. F. A. officers, the standing committees, and the individual members, has been to work out these ideals practically. The constructive program of the Foreign Relations Office of the N. S. F. A. illustrates the service of this organization to the students of American colleges, and to that larger organization, the International Confederation of Students, of which the N. S. F. A. is a member.

This program includes: the management of American student tours to visit the students of Europe in the summer time; the reception of incoming groups of foreign students; the issuance of an international student Identity Card, which enables students to obtain reductions on visas, etc.; the service of providing information on international student affairs for students in American universities and colleges; and the management of foreign debating teams visiting the United States.

Harvard's Reading Periods

From the Annual Report of President Lowell of Harvard

THE most far-reaching experiment in the College—and in the Graduate School, except for the seminary courses—has been that of the reading periods, of which the object and plan were described in the last annual report. The first of them covered the two and a half weeks between Christmas vacation and the midyear examinations, the second, the three and a half weeks preceding the finals. At these times all courses, save those for Freshmen and in elementary subjects, were suspended in most of the departments and so was all tutoring, except in the spring for men about to take their general examinations at that time. Reading or laboratory work to be done during these periods were assigned by instructors in courses and by tutors, the ground so covered being the subject of questions in the examination paper on the course in which it was required.

The plan is experimental and will for a time remain so, yet at the outset it has resulted at least as favorably as was expected. It has been referred to by other colleges as the "pre-examination reading period," as if the object were to provide a chance for review. Curiously enough, this was never contemplated, the dates being fixed for quite different reasons of convenience; and, in fact, so much reading was assigned that there was no time for review. Perhaps this misconception was based on the idea expressed in some quarters that the student would regard these periods as unofficial vacation, a fear that has been very far from justified. Ten years ago, before the attitude of our students toward their work was changed, we should not have ventured to try such a plan, but now the time for it has proved ripe. Although no registration was required after Christmas vacation, the undergraduates took their duties seriously, and no instance of abuse or grave neglect has been brought to the notice of the Dean. The reading rooms at the Harry Elkins Widener Memorial Library were crowded as never before, the number of books drawn for home use from the general reading room increased 75 per cent, and from the stacks in the second period 52 per cent, while the Co-operative Society sold many more volumes than usual during these periods.

The examination in the suspended courses included, as already stated, questions upon the reading assigned, and the student's answers to those questions throw light upon the effect of the plan. On the whole, the answers of the higher scholars—those who attained an A or a B, and even the upper level of men of grade C—were better than in the matter covered by the regular instruction in the course. Students explained this by the fact that their reading had not been interrupted by attending classes, so that it was more consecutive and hence better assimilated. Something may also be due to their being on their mettle to show that they could work well without help. But whatever the cause, it would seem clear that after a certain amount of careful instruction in a course they were in a condition to read by themselves with profit. On the other hand, the lower scholars—the rest of the C's and the D's and the E's—did less well on these questions than on the matters in which they had not had direct teaching in class. That is not surprising, yet it is thought that such men derived a distinct benefit from the experience of trying to walk on their own feet. An attempt at self-education may be highly profitable in the long run, although the immediate effect is a falling off in attainment. . . .

One of the objects of the reading period was a relief to the instructors in courses, and still more to the tutors, from a burden which has become heavier by reason of

the growth in scholarly attitude among the undergraduates. As their pace has become faster, the pressure upon the teachers of all kinds has increased, rendering it more difficult for them to keep abreast of their own subjects, and to make the contributions to knowledge which are the great reward and crown of a scholar's life. Dean Moore remarks in his report that "the relief given to the teachers by the reading period is evidently considerable and should contribute in a measure to scholarly pursuits; at any rate the teacher will be less overworked at times when the burden of theses and examinations is heavy upon them."

A Seminar in the Orient

By F. McCracken Fisher

LAST spring *The New Student* sponsored a hopeful venture that called itself "The Upton Close-New Student Tour to the Orient." It was the first of its kind —*for* students with average "tourists" carefully excluded and at student rates (those who took but four hundred dollars actually got home without wiring for money)—and up until this time there has been no word in these columns as to how the expedition fared. This may be partially due the fact that the ex-members have been so busy telling about the many phases of the adventure, both by word and pen, that the editor has not been able to ensnare one into the pages of *The New Student*. The members, some forty-three strong, are all back now (some continued on through Siberia, Russia and the tamer parts of Europe back to the Atlantic coast, and others remained some months longer in Japan), and it becomes necessary for us to render an accounting.

We will not dwell on the sea-trip, those two weeks of daily lectures and round-tables with our leader that passed so much more quickly than any two weeks have a right to pass, nor even upon Yokohama with its hundreds of welcoming Japanese lanterns waving on the docks, but skip directly to Tokyo where the venture began to bear other interesting fruit. We had scarcely acquired our land-legs when we were given a most crowded and valuable afternoon's program. First it was a reception at the Department of Education, with non-English speaking Minister Shoda as host. Through our excellent interpreter, Mr. Nelson, he gave us a very flowery address, lamenting the fact that the tendency of Japanese students seemed to be to embrace all the teachings of Western civilization indiscriminately and reject all culture that was Japanese, a truly deplorable condition as we agreed. He stated that his great task as Minister of Education would be to re-inculcate the best of the Japanese ideals and traditions into the spirit of Japanese youth, to save for the world the valuable things of Japanese culture through the medium of the Japanese school system. He did not actually utter the word "patriotism" but he verged so near it that some of us grew suspicious, and our suspicions were later confirmed on finding that he is the most reactionary member of a reactionary government. We later found also that his program includes barring the study of social science to all students, the appropriation of several million yen to create a vast, old-fashioned spy system in all schools whose duty it is to see that no "dangerous thoughts" are thought, no sociology is studied secretly, no progressive or socialistic groups of students are allowed to meet or even form, and other like measures. The other functions of the afternoon were another reception, this by University of Washington alumni in co-operation with the Foreign Office, at which a great deal of tea and French pastry were the outstanding features, and a banquet tendered by Japan's "grand old man," Viscount Shibusawa (incidentally, tendered on real gold plate). At this latter there spoke Dr. Nitobe, one of the founders of the League of Nations and for ten years chairman of its Secretariat. He convinced us that there were some Japanese who were not Imperio-militaristic.

Passing over the beauties, the history and the art of Japan without a word, we must, however, pause at the feet of Toyohiko Kagawa, that young man who is *living* the Sermon on the Mount in the slums of Osaka, and thereby becoming the spiritual leader of the youth (and of the laborers) of Japan.

Crossing over to China via Korea, we were extended a most interesting, unusual and altogether royal welcome, —we were privileged to attend the "wake" in the funeral services of old Chang Tso-lin, a scene of barbaric splendor and a theater of barbaric music and wailings such as none of us had even hoped to experience. After that a real Chinese banquet.

Peking, the Xanadu of Coleridge, we achieved three weeks after it had fallen to the Nationalists, and they were just coming in to take possession. Due to friendships formed through years of adventuring with the now leaders, Upton Close was able to arrange meetings for us with General Chiang Kai-shek, Minister T. V. Soong and many others. In Nanking, to which city some of us pushed our way during the Fifth Plenary Session of the Kuomintang, interviews were had with Dr. C. T. Wang, "Christian" General Feng Yu Hsiang, Tan Yen Kai, etc. It was interesting to note that a large percentage of the leaders of the Government in China today come from the ranks of "returned students." At present those earlier students who have now passed the age-line between liberalism and conservatism are in the positions of power and are running things, much to the exasperation of those newly returned and those still studying.

Upton Close is so satisfied with the outcome of the venture and so persuaded that some real international education has been achieved that he is planning to lead another group of students to the Orient again this year. If they come back with an understanding of the people of Eastern Asia and the conditions under which those people work and live, like that gained by the "class of '28," imperfect and incomplete though that understanding may be, Upton Close will feel that the effort has been worth while and that many more Americans will be enabled to meet the dawning Pacific era intelligently and usefully.

The Intercollegiate World

The Obstreperous Chinese

PICTURE if you can 2000 students, angered, say, by the inadequacy of the Kellogg Pact, marching noisily to the office of Secretary Kellogg, demanding an audience with him, and then, finding him not in, proceeding to his residence which they wreck. For good measure they administer a sound drubbing to several policemen and minor officials of the State Department who attempt to restrain them. If your mental agility hasn't balked here, imagine President Coolidge anxiously summoning them to the White House lawn where he lectures them in somewhat the following manner: "Your patriotism is admirable, but I feel you do not fully understand the policy of our government. For diplomatic reasons we cannot go too fast. Your illegal actions only embarrass us. Rest assured that the government is proceeding in a true peace-loving spirit, and should you find that all armaments are not abandoned within three years, then you may cut off my head."

This hasn't happened. It won't. But the momentary phantasy may make more vivid the action of a student mob from the Central Government University in Nanking, China, which a few weeks ago wrecked the home of Minister of Foreign Affairs C. T. Wang, before being pacified by President Chiang Kai-shek. Just as it had seemed that the Chinese students had abandoned politics to the solons of the Kuomintang and returned to their books this new outbreak occurred. The provocation seems to have been the belief that the Government wasn't proceeding fast enough in the abolition of unequal treaties, coupled with the rumor that Minister Wang and Minister of Finance T. V. Soong had recognized Japan's claims of the infamous Nishihara loans of 1919 as a concession to Japan's consent to tariff autonomy. But the National Anti-Japan Association in a series of demonstrations in Nanking had decreed no concessions, and the grapevine rumor following closely after a week of anti-Japanese agitation fanned the ebbing coals of student ardor. To cool them required President Chiang's generous wager of his head against the unequal treaties.

This recent outbreak, however, seems to be the exception rather than the rule now in Chinese student activities. It is an atavistic throw-back to the tumultous days of 1919-1925 when students stumped the country from one end to the other, agitating against imperialist intervention, forcing out the traitorous Anfu clique which had attempted to barter away China's sovereignty, and ushering in the Nationalist Revolution. Last summer the conclusion of the first military stage of the Revolution was symbolized by the renaming of Peking, the Northern Capital, to Peiping, City of Peace. The student movement habit of opposition seems to have been slower in adjustment, as evidenced by the Nanking incident. Possibly the students acted upon the ancient Mencian presumption "if a person has the power of authority, nine chances out of ten he is using it wrongly." Perhaps too, they of a generation that has become articulate since the early struggles of the Nationalist drive resented the injunction of the older revolutionists: "Stick to your books."

The future of the Chinese student movement is not easily predictable except in generalities. Sporadic political outbreaks may continue to enliven an otherwise serene scholastic life. But already the tremendous energy of the movement as a whole has been diverted into new and constructive channels, we are informed by a correspondent in a recent number of the *China Weekly Review*. The rights of co-education and self-government won, a determination for study has taken hold of the students almost as a fad. But the "back to the books" trend has not meant a revival of the old scholasticism of rote learning. The Renaissance has begun. Research is the order of the day—research for the specific purpose of applying scietific knowledge to China's problems of reconstruction. Most prominent in the curriculum are courses of natural science, medicine, engineering, commerce, agriculture, and education. The most capable students are no longer going into politics but into the mass education, rural school, and vernacular language movements. Dr. John Dewey and Dr. Hu Shih are the new patron scholars. It means that the reconstructive era of nation-building has set in and that the real revolution in China, as in Russia, is social, and only secondarily political.

Project Method

AT WILLIAMS an interesting application of the "project method" to college education wins a front page story in the *Record*. Desiring to "test the power and ability of the students to use materials which they have unearthed for themselves," Professor Dutton of the English Department released his students from class attendance between Christmas vacation and midyears and set them to studying an author of the Victorian period by themselves.

President Little

TO be unbending in one's loyalty to worthy ideals and at the same time see the necessity for making occasional retreats, by compromising on less essential features of one's program, is a delicate problem that every reformer must face. This requires a nice sense of balance, and it must sadly be recorded that in politics, in economic life and in education, our promising Young Men in a Hurry usually end up by tipping the scales too far on the side of compromise. Lost leaders are one of our most famous products.

One thing is clear in the welter of charges and counter charges that have attended the abrupt end of President Clarence Little's brief period at the University of Michigan is that he has scorned the broad and easy path of glib compromise. He came to the University in 1925 at the age of 37 with a sensible program of University reform and some definite personal opinions on various matters and he leaves without having sacrificed any of them to a shallow expediency. It is possible to find fault with his tactics: his installation of the university reform over the head of the faculty was open to serious criticism, and the summary way in which he dealt with the liquor and automobile problems of the campus; but one gathers from the accounts that a hopeless chasm existed between the President and that large conservative mass of Michigan people. There was nothing for President Little to do but resign.

Almost everything he proposed to do evoked stubborn opposition from parties interested in keeping every Michigan institution and idea from the contamination of change. The proposal to segregate freshmen and sophomores in a separate school, and weed out the unwilling and incapable at the end of the second year by investing the next two years of study with the responsibility and freedom of graduate students, was wrecked by faculty mistrust and departmental jealousy. The politicians of the State were in arms when it was suggested that the university tax experts overhaul the State taxing system. The regents balked at the plan to build dormitories for all the students, and the townsfolk naturally sided with the regents. The League of Catholic Women led the chorus of disapproval over President Little's outspoken advocacy of birth control and Mrs. Alfred Brosseau, National President of the D. A. R. and University donor, objected to his denunciation of the Daughters' notorious blacklist on liberals and radicals.

If the *Michigan Daily* is any gauge of student opinion the undergraduates

were with their President, even though there had been family quarrels at times. In an editorial entitled "Michigan Turns Her Back on Genius" the *Daily* said:

"He passes into private life with no immediate prospects of employment, but with the satisfaction of having held to an ideal despite the demands of dictatorial legislators, or of so-called independent students. Michigan loses with his passing a man who had greater potentialities as one of the foremost educators of the world, than any man at present in the educational field in the United States. In his entire career he has been harassed by petty interference, has been stalled and halted by petty class feelings and has always been the victim of Middle-West narrowness and prejudice. Yet he has always remained intelligently aloof from his detractors; he has pursued the course as he wished; he accomplished many great things in his brief tenancy, and as he leaves, those who believed in him and saw in his ideas the future greatness of the University of Michigan are genuinely sorry that the middle class minds of the Middle West are not yet enough developed to understand a man with vision, with aspirations, and with a genuine grasp of educational affairs. . . .

"The 'University College' has drawn the attention of the whole country as one of the most important educational innovations in years. The only criticism that has been directed against it has come from within the university itself, where scholastic stand-patters rebelled at changing educational systems which had been tested by time. One of the biggest criticisms of the proposal was that it would tend to break down the system of caste and preference which had been built up in the University faculty, to usurp the position of men who had been steeped in the Michigan educational system for years and years without progress. They preferred to retain their stolid Middle-Western smugness rather than let one new idea steal into their private territory."

Collegiate, Collegiate . . .

THE raucous jazz notes of "Collegiate, Collegiate, yes we are collegiate" have penetrated the awful and silent depths of the dean's office. It is not a welcome tune, and something ought to be done about it. So at the next convention of deans in April the words will be revised to read "Yes, but *are* we collegiate?"

Something may eventually be done about it. In the meantime, a questionnaire. Dean Henry Grattan Doyle of George Washington University has sent one to four hundred deans. He asks, among many questions:

Is neatness in appearance, as evidenced by clean shaving, well-shined shoes, starched linen, appropriate neckties of neat appearance and well-pressed suits of clothing, typical of your student body? or,

In the main, does the psychological attitude of your student body approve of slouchy and careless habits of dress and conduct or neat habits of dress and courteous manners?

It does not require a very keen mind to predict what the answer to that will be. Already the reassuring replies are coming back. From Wesleyan:

"The present generation of students here, as I look upon them, are well-dressed, well-behaved, a very different type from what we had twenty-five years ago. . . .

"Speaking in general of the morals of the community, I feel perfectly sure that they are on a higher plane than they have ever been. . . . "

We have a pretty strong conviction that Dean Doyle will be able to report at the convention that on the word of 399 deans this generation is the best yet. (The one exception will be Harvard, which has already refused to answer the questions.)

But aren't the deans waking up to the collegiate menace two or three years late? Collegiatism is dying out in the colleges, though it will linger on in remote colleges, in front of drugstores, and on vaudeville platforms for a long while. There is something of romantic excess in the collegiate costume that is out of key with these prosaic times. Bell-bottom trousers, un-anchored socks and suchlike are as much relics of the past as is the fashion of carrying the *American Mercury*. (They read *The New Yorker* now.)

The fearful dean should read any "What Young Men Are Wearing" column in the magazines that cater to college youth. There college men are being told that a neat conservative appearance is a "valuable asset" and that "anyone in the business world who hopes to make good is lost without it." The garter manufacturers depict in full-page ads the terrible tragedies that befall those who have no "Sox Appeal" and the Arrow collar people are out gunning for the informal roll-collared shirt of the out-of-style "drugstore cowboy." Even the coonskin coat is passing.

Other times, other manners. The collegiate mode is passing out. The reason it is going is the reason why all fashions change. The hoi polloi, drug clerks and farm hands, have caught up with it. The next job for college men is to create a new fashion. Otherwise the four years would be wasted, and there would be no way to distinguish between those who have had the privilege of a college education and those who have not.

Ezra Pound's Plan

APPALLING as is the amount of time wasted by unessential or unorganized reading, there are few real attempts in college to help the student find an ordered plan in the mighty maze of literature. Ezra Pound in a recent issue of *Books* of the *New York Herald-Tribune* gives the student the benefit of his own experience in reading:

"Literary instruction in our 'institutions of learning' was, at the beginning of this century, cumbrous and inefficient. I dare say it still is. Certain more or less mildly exceptional professors were affected by the 'beauties' of various authors (usually deceased) but the system, as a whole, lacked sense and co-ordination. I dare say it still does. But when studying physics we are not asked to investigate the biographies of all the disciples of Newton who showed interest in science, but who failed to make any discovery. Neither their unrewarded gropings, hopes, passions, laundry bills or erotic experiences are thrust on the hurried student or considered germane to the subject."

Mr. Pound would have the student read those books which make some epochal contribution to literature. He says:

"And we could, presumably, apply to the study of literature a little of the common sense that we currently apply to physics or to biology. In poetry there are simple procedures, and there are known discoveries, clearly marked. As I have said in various places in my as yet unorganized and fragmentary volumes: in each age one or two men of genius find something, and express it. It may be in only a line or in two lines, or in some quality of a cadence; and thereafter two dozen, or two hundred, or two or more thousand followers repeat and dilute and modify.

"And if the instructor would select his specimens from works that contain these discoveries and solely on the basis of discovery—which may lie in the dimension of depth, not merely of some novelty on the surface—he would aid his student far more than by presenting his authors at random, and talking about them in tot."

Undergraduate Humor

College Humor has lost its reprint rights over the midwest college comics, by action of the Midwest College Comics Association. The undergraduate humorists decided at their recent convention that this action would have to be taken because *College Humor* misrepresents college life to the public by over-emphasizing Prohibition and sex jokes. Another reason was that the magazine represented to the national advertisers that it had a large circulation among college students, thus reducing the amount of advertising given to college magazines. Last year the western college comics took the same action, basing it on the first of the two reasons.

Skeptical persons will scent a bit of hypocrisy on the part of the stu-

dent comics in the second-named reason for their action since the comics themselves are not averse to printing a large number of liquor and sex jokes of extremely inane character. *The Columns*, a literary magazine at Cornell, has analyzed *The Cornell Widow*, a typical comic, and these are the statistics for its first three issues this year:

	First Issue	*Second Issue*	*Third Issue*
Puns and double meanings of phrases	23	32	40
Neckings, legs, lingerie	15	18	18
Liquor	4	4	3
Local	19	8	12
Incomprehensible	2	5	11
Nonsense	3	5	3
Miscellaneous	7	11	7

The Column's comment upon this magazine might well apply to many other comics:

". . . *The Widow* is not above an indecent joke, especially if it can be neatly placed among the exchanges and advertising pages. But *The Widow* has neither the virility to capture a Rabelaisian spirit, nor to prance with the rough humor of Russian comedy, nor the subtlety to turn a black joke until it shows a silver lining. At its sad best, *The Widow* produced a series of vulgar puns in its football issue — the How dare you, Sir, sort—which might cause a freshman to hesitate before sending his copy home."

Toward Freedom

ONE admirable college reform that is making considerable headway this winter is optional class attendance. Over a dozen colleges have granted it to favored groups since the college year opened. Students who manager to get this measure accepted "in principle" by the authorities are reminded that very often what the Dean giveth the college professor taketh away. *The Barnard Bulletin* complains that although this was to be a year of experiment in senior freedom from compulsory attendance, some professors have practiced nullification. "Almost immediately we were warned of the psychological effect absence from class would have on professors. . . . To climax the whole attitude, we know at least one instructor who has gone to the extreme of giving an extra examination to all seniors who have overcut."

"Futbal"

A MISSIONARY in behalf of "futbal", as the Latin newspapers spell it, is laboring in Mexico. Dr. Michael Smith Bennett, director of athletics at the University of the South, is in Mexico City for the purpose of initiating young Mexicans into the football mysteries. The importance of this visit is indicated by the fact that President Gil took offici tl notice of it, by publicly thanking Dr. Bennett. So enthusiastic a response has Dr. Bennett managed to awaken that he has been scheduled for a series of lectures at the Universities of Jalapa, Vera Cruz, Puebla, Oaxaca and Guadalajara. While Mexican college youth are by no means a sedentary lot,—one popular form of recreation in that country where hitch-hiking is unknown, is the taking of walking trips of hundreds of miles across the mountains, — they need more games, and football will probably become extremely popular. But we warn our southern brethren to consider well before they import the American game bag and baggage to their playing fields. They ought to decide whether they want a sport for its own sake or sport for the mere sake of winning games. Dr. Bennett apparently is incapable of teaching them the distinction between these two categories, judging from a cable report on his activities. "I will have a football eleven before I leave this city and in about two years the University of Mexico will be ready to make its appearance on American gridirons. It will be a great day when we have international football contests."

If Mexican students intend to play the game with Americans and in the American spirit they will have to start looking for a $20,000 coach, send their scouts out to scour the country from Yucatan to Sonora for likely football material, provide scholarships at the University for needy football stars and commence raising money for that one-hundred-thousand-passenger stadium.

Big News

A DOUBLE-DECK headline in heavy black letters over two inches tall announced in the *University of Washington Daily* that the student government of Washington has requested the resignation of Coach Enoch W. Bagshaw: the type-size which according to the old newspaper joke, is usually held in reserve for the end of the world.

As a coach Enoch W. Bagshaw is a failure. "Torchy" Torrence, a "prominent" alumnus, gave voice to the general dissatisfaction of student body and alumni, at the hearing before the board of control which asked that Mr. Bagshaw leave despite the fact that his contract has not yet expired. Here is what Torchy says:

"While Baggy is one of my best friends, I feel that to release him from his contract would be the greatest thing that we could do for him. Because of his lack of personality, Baggy cannot sell himself and Washington to the students, the high school students, the high school coaches, the people or the alumni. It is best for the University of Washington that Baggy go."

Students compose a majority of the board of control; and the *Daily* rejoices in this action because it demonstrates to the skeptical that student government is at last a reality. All the professors on the board voted against the resignation, and when the measure went to a higher body for approval, the faculty athletic committee, it was emphatically voted down. Now the situation has resolved itself into a deadlock, with professors aligned against students and President M. Lyle Spencer keeping judiciously mum.

Once more it is demonstrated how the greatest college activity has slipped completely out of the hands of educators. The professors have suddenly collided with a huge amalgamation of interests throughout the State which insanely clamor for a coach who will produce winning teams: the high school students, the high school coaches, the people of the state, the alumni, and the boys and girls who frequent the University classrooms.

The big football machine needs winning teams or there will be disastrous financial results and the economic determinists need not go farther for a coldly practical reason for the students' action. Losing teams during the last few years have brought about a precarious financial condition. Football in the 1928 season fell short of its budget by approximately $40,000, and gross receipts were nearly $100,000 less than the previous year. Gate receipts in 1927 were $218,617 and less than $125,000 the following year. What the University evidently needs is not another coach but a Tex Rickard!

Slack Times

A SLUMP in enrollments at last! The per cent of gain in number of students attending college is lower this year than it has been for a long time, *The Boston Transcript* finds in its annual survey of college enrollments.

It may be that we have reached the apex of this long upward climb in enrollments, beginning in 1890 with a total of 120,000 students in all colleges and reaching 850,000 in 1929.

The reasons for this slump are several. Dean Raymond Walters in *School and Society* gives these possible reasons: agricultural and industrial conditions; the development of junior colleges and deliberate limitation of enrollments.

It will be necessary to await the figures for the next half dozen years to determine whether we have reached a permanent level.

Reviewer's Copy

A Recent Gain in Criticism

By NEWTON ARVIN

UNDERGRADUATES, as all who traffic with them know, are tenaciously and instinctively Manichaean, or at any rate dualistic. Reality presents itself to them habitually as a conflict between light and darkness or a contrast between black and white. Their imaginations are pre-Hegelian. Thesis and antithesis they can comprehend and accept: synthesis, as a metaphysical process, lies unreachably beyond them. It is perhaps a cause of this, perhaps a result, that academic discussion falls back so constantly, for a resource, on the method of the dilemma. Are you an Idealist or a Realist? (It will not do to protest that an awakened realism may have its ideal criteria.) Are you a Mechanist or a Vitalist? (Every word you utter will be used against you: the choice, it is implied, is a forced one.) Are you an Optimist or a Pessimist? (But what if the conditions of life seem to you largely evil, and its possibilities almost unimaginably rich and good?) These are the sacred dichotomies of the classroom, and it is in the gentle, rhythmic vacillation between their extremes that the undergraduate mind is mesmerized into indifference and peace. Caveat mediator!

In this respect, however, undergraduates are not really unique and should not be singled out for special rebuke. Their fathers and mothers—our contemporaries and compatriots—are, in general, behind them. It is characteristic of the American mind, on many levels,—it is a symptom of its immaturity,—that it should insist on the sharpest distinctions between black and white, between friend and foe, between the sheep and the goats. He that is not with us without reservation, is against us root and branch. Thoroughgoing conformity or mere negative dissent—that is the choice that has traditionally been thrust upon the adult American. And what has been the effect upon our criticism? Has it not constantly pitched its voice too high or too low? Has it not been strident, querulous, dyspeptic, on the one hand; unctuous and deprecatory, on the other? Certainly it has long seemed true that to be critical at all, in this country, has meant to stop with negation. Certainly the available affirmations have long been impossible to accept. Hence we have really had among us, as exclusive types, the Realist and the Idealist; the Tender-minded and the Tough-minded; the Optimist and the Pessimist. But if our criticism is ever to "grow up," it is obvious that it must put behind it these adolescent dichotomies; must mediate between affirmation and negation; must at length become truly philosophical—which is to say, disinterested and just. That there is a real prospect of its doing this, is demonstrated by a late symposium, edited by Mr. Kirby Page, on *Recent Gains in American Civilization*[1]—a volume compiled with the avowed purpose, as its title indicates, of presenting the sunny side of the picture; but a volume written, by and large, so reticently, so judiciously, and with so disciplined a skepticism, that few readers would be tempted to accuse its authors of being either optimists or pessimists. If this achievement is followed up, there will be at least one "gain" that we need not challenge.

It is true that there are one or two pretty consistent optimists, and at least one resolute pessimist, among the feasters at this banquet; but the notes they strike are out of harmony with the general tone of the discussion. I should not like to have to reduce to order the substance of Dr. David Starr Jordan's incoherent paper on "Recent Advances in Science"; but it seems fairly clear that Dr. Jordan subscribes to the hopeful positivism of an earlier and less troubled generation. He says little about the "recent advances" of his title (surely there should have been plenty to say!), but he implies that such advances have the meaning that Comte or Huxley would have attached to them. "Science alone can form," he says, "a sound basis for the conduct of life. The art of living, or ethics, can fall back on no final authority. . . . The primal great function of science is to widen and strengthen the human mind. It makes humanity worth while." But of course it is not necessary to be a medievalist or an obscurantist in order to feel that the last sentence overstates the case for science. Similarly with Mr. Dallas Lore Sharp's article, "Education Goes Ahead." Mr. Sharp's expectancy about American education it should be easy to share, but it is less easy to appreciate the exuberance with which he records that (1) "it is amazingly well organized," (2) "teaching, clear down the line, has become a profession," (3) "along with [this] has gone a development in the physical equipment of education unparalleled in any other time or land," and (4) "the public school is recognized as a national institution, bent strictly upon the nation's business." These things of course are advances, but they are obviously advances in technique; and to dwell on them alone is to leave untouched the question of educational content. On this head, one may have one's doubts; and such doubts will not be dispelled by Mr. Sharp's breezy allusion to "the Boy and Girl Scouts, Hi-Y Clubs, 4-H Clubs—all making for mental and physical poise, community spirit, good manners, larger reading and finer feeling."

Optimism so relatively uncritical as Dr. Jordan's and Mr. Sharp's is certainly not congenial to our current mood. What are we to say, conversely, to the more penetrating pessimism of Mr. Harry F. Ward, who writes on "Progress or Decadence?" Here are the dark negations with which, in the last two decades, we have become almost indifferently familiar. Our social experi-

[1] *Recent Gains in American Civilization.* Edited by Kirby Page. N. Y. Harcourt Brace & Co. $3.00.

ment in America, says Mr. Ward, was inspired in the beginning by the two ideals of freedom and equality; and for a time those ideals were really approximated in practice. Today they are denied and outraged by every fact of our economic and political life: systematic repression and organized inequality have usurped their place. "Our political philosophy is rooted in freedom and equality, our industrial practice tends irresistibly toward monopoly and concentration of power. It is this basic conflict between our culture and our economic activities that tears our life asunder and leaves it broken and disordered." Naturally, in such a state of things, Mr. Ward sees little to hope for in the future: we are scarcely likely to return in practice to the ideals of Jacksonian Democracy. Mr. Ward's pessimism is to that extent a serious and cogent position. If one dissents from it at all, it is because the appeal it makes is to our belief in freedom and equality as absolute values; because it is a pessimism based on regret for a past to which we cannot desire to return. Freedom and equality we may still recognize as relative goods, and their flagrant denial as a genuine evil; but our real problems are too positive and too personal to be permanently solved in such terms.

That is why one reads with so much satisfaction and sympathy most of the other articles in this volume. Particular conclusions, in every case, one can doubtless take issue with; the general attitude of critical but not sardonic detachment, one can only welcome and hope to emulate. These writers are, all of them, men and women who have never committed themselves to acceptance of things as they are; and their description of our "gains" is, as a result, genuinely authoritative. Take, for example, what Mr. Charles Beard says in his article on "Recent Gains in Government." Mr. Beard makes no claim for the finality or sanctity of our political system, but he points out that in the last twenty-five years, as compared with any similar previous period, substantial and tangible advances have been made both legislatively and administratively—"advances in efficiency, in standards of public honor, social justice, and humanity." Mr. Stuart Chase, writing on "New Outposts of Business and Industry," is similarly tentative: business and finance, as distinguished from industry, he condemns as an exciting but dangerous game; in the development of modern industry, on the other hand, he sees certain real and probably durable gains that can be stated not merely in technical but in psychological language. He even regards as a possibility the eventual socialization of American industry, not by revolution, but from within its own process. In the tendencies of recent American journalism Mr. Oswald Villard detects bright spots of the same order—improvement in the quality of news in the best papers, increasing attention to news from abroad, growing freedom from the incubus of the advertiser, and the experiments in impersonal journalism of which the New York *Times* is the most conspicuous.

On "Advances in the Quest for Peace," Mr. Norman Thomas writes with the chariest skepticism, yet without melodramatic despair. The advances he notes are, again, as they ought to be, advances in what is called "psychology," not in mechanical change—advances toward greater realism in facing the problems of war and peace, toward disillusion about the utility of war to achieve the end it nominally seeks, toward tough-mindedness on the part of peace advocates themselves. The tone of Miss van Kleeck's article on industrial relations is indicated by the question she raises at the outset: "What instances can the United States show of that harmonious inter-relation between human beings in industry which is the sign of satisfactory conditions?" However cautious the answer to such a question must be—and Miss van Kleeck's answer does not err on the side of overstatement—it is certain that the very phrasing of the question is a step toward clarity and understanding. Words like "harmonious" and "satisfactory" need, no doubt, to be defined: but the question itself, compared with most of the questions raised in the same connection, is a serious and substantial one. So, of course, is the question dealt with by Mr. Charles S. Johnson in his article on race relations; and one feels, in consequence, that the modest improvements Mr. Johnson records are tangible and, in quality, permanent.

In running over thus hastily some of the most interesting essays in the volume, I have hinted at another of its virtues. I repeat that its chief distinction is its poise and balance, the refusal of most of its contributors to take sides passionately with either the boosters or the prophets of despair. I repeat that this probably argues a genuine realignment in American criticism, a genuine movement from "thesis" and "antithesis" (in no exact Hegelian sense!) to "synthesis." Surely it is another virtue of the book, another gain for criticism, that all the problems of better and worse that are involved should be here so generally envisaged in their true proportions, that so many critically-minded men and women should be thinking in terms of qualities rather than of quantities, in terms of value rather than of technique. If this were not true, the transition to "synthesis" would be worse than vain: without a resolute adherence to humane standards, without a determination to keep ideal ends in view, the willingness to mediate would decline to mere neutrality, mere compromise, and at last mere indifference. That is what happened, as everyone knows, to the pseudo-critical movement of twenty and thirty years ago, the movement of which the "muckrakers" were the leading spirits. It must be the chief concern of the critical mind in our own period to prevent a repetition of that fiasco; and if the spirit of Mr. Page's symposium—a spirit most explicitly incorporated in Professor Dewey's fine essay, "A Critique of American Civilization"—becomes general and secure, there will be no danger of such a catastrophe.

More Notes on Freedom

A Reply to Miss La Follette's Articles on Freedom

CURRENT and widely accepted ethical theories are seldom formulated or defended. Therein lies their greatest strength. It may be thought, for instance, that capitalism has no philosophic defenders because it needs none, but there is some truth in the view that it needs no defense because its champions have discreetly refrained from elucidating the ridiculous arguments upon which its canons are to be justified. The sincere enemy of freedom will therefore be deeply grateful for the careful presentation given by Miss La Follette to the ethical doctrine of freedom.

Confessing to an antipathy towards freedom, we may as well admit all the further implications of our position, as laid down by Miss La Follette. We do stand "in favor of coercion." We do share "the assumption that the welfare of society as a whole can possibly be promoted by restrictive laws which entail privileges for one class and disabilities for another." We are guilty of "the widespread conviction, which gives power to such organizations as the W. C. T. U., that it is a legitimate function of organized society to shield individuals from temptation." We share "the confidence in their own opinions which those who advocate any forcibile regulation of human conduct must necessarily possess." We would not deny even the allied charge of being "among the most enlightened members of the community."

The word "liberty," as Madame Roland suggested, is a dangerous one, and the theories that have been committed in its name testify grandly to the potentialities of any word that unites a strong eulogistic flavor with a wide ambiguity of meaning. There is certainly something peculiar about a word to which appeal is made alike by anarchists and republicans, by social reformers and judicial atavists, by warring nations and conscientious objectors. It is therefore most important in considering the adequacy of liberty or freedom as a supreme standard of political and social behavior to disentangle the various meanings of our formula and to present each to the mind rather than the confused whole to the emotions. Perhaps it will be found then that ambiguity and inconsistency attach not only to the word but to the separate ideas it has been used to denote.

In its widest sense, the doctrine of freedom is an insistence upon "the right of the individual to go to the devil in his own way," and a denial of the right of individuals to interfere with each other. Already a contradiction emerges. What are those individuals to do who wish to interfere with other people, who would like, for instance, to go to the devil and preach to him the annoying doctrine of tolerance? Absolute freedom is as meaningless as absolute nearness, and the arguments advanced in its favor naturally inherit its antinomies. We are told that since there is no absolute good, we ought not to impose upon other people our own preferences. But if this tolerance is itself ultimately good our doctrine is self-contradictory, and if it is not, then it must be simply one more ethical preference no better than the preferences of the Klan or the Inquisition. A second argument that since we do not know what is really good for others, we ought to let them decide questions of conduct for themselves repeats our antinomy. *Ex hypothesi* we cannot know that it is good for others that we leave them alone. We have attempted to derive an ethical system from our ethical ignorance, and we have naturally failed.

The general theory of liberty, then, turns out to be nonsense. In what limitations shall we find meaning for our ideal? Miss La Follette has suggested the three standard answers to this question, apparently believing that they are all equivalent, which may, in a sense, be true.

In the first place, we are told not to "confound liberty with license," and advised, for instance, "to guide the child without falling into the mistake of regulating it." But unfortunately we do not learn anything about our children when we christen them, and we have not solved our problem by giving it a new name.

The notion of "equal freedom," or "the maximum freedom of each in so far as consistent with the like freedom of all," seems to suggest a limitation of our ideal that provides an escape from some difficulties. But what does "equal freedom" mean? The courts tell us we must not prescribe limits to the industrial bargain because this would upset the equal liberty of the employer and employee. A self-styled "Woman's Party" tells us that we must repeal special restrictions upon the hours of labor for women in factories because this interferes with equal liberty between the sexes. We are not to equalize the inheritance of the new generation because the equal liberty of all to bequeath whatever they have earned is thereby destroyed. What is to happen when equal liberty to bequeath what one owns interferes with equal freedom to inherit what one needs, when equal liberty to sign a paper excludes equal liberty to live a decent life, when equal "opportunities" for women in mines or factories are incompatible with equal opportunities to receive a mother's care in infancy, all these are problems whose solution the very formulation of the doctrine in question precludes. The ground is not far to seek. It is metaphysical nonsense to talk of equal liberties without specifying the respects in which this equality is to apply. No two things are absolutely alike. Similarity has meaning only on the background of diversity. We can significantly talk of equal liberties only in respect to this or that end. The liberty of the miner to contract is equal, in certain formal and legal aspects, to that of the mine-owner. In respect to other considerations, the liberties of the two parties are fundamentally and widely distinct. The judge who talks of the necessity for preserving equal liberties in such a case is invalidly assuming that an aspect of conduct which appeals to him is *the* correct index of equality.

The real attractiveness and the real danger of the doctrine of equal liberties lie precisely in this essential indeterminateness. In its dress all personal preferences ashamed of their nakedness assume the aspect of transcendental dignity. But the ethical standards by which we actually judge different sorts of liberty to be equally valuable do not attain validity by our refusal to look at them.

It is a fundamental law of physics that balance results only when inequality of leverage compensates for inequality of mass. If in the right of each individual to live the good life all men are equal, it follows that there must be a balancing of unequal powers. All children are not equal in health or in the opportunity to lay a firm economic foundation for decent living. Men and women cannot bear the same physical burdens. There ought therefore to be an unequal distribution of social forces which will bring some balance into the moral world. The whole function of government is the imposition and enforcement of "restrictive laws which entail privileges for one class and disabilities for another."

Driven from its ambitious outposts, the doctrine of freedom takes final refuge in a last set of restrictions and reservations. Man ought to be free in his "private life," or in that part of his activity which does not interfere with the rights of others. To quote from Mill's classic

essay, "The only part of the conduct of anyone for which he is amenable to society is that which concerns others. . . . Over himself, over his body and mind, the individual is sovereign." The significance of the libertarian doctrine at this point is almost nil. What acts of any importance do any of us perform that do not "concern" others? Is not the fact of social interference itself *prima facie* evidence that our conduct has affected and disturbed others? Freedom, in any important or worthy phase of life, overflows the outlines of the individual soul, affects the rights of others, and is a vital concern of society.

It is indeed a strait fortress into which the doctrine of freedom has retreated, and one might pray, "*Requiescat in pace*," did not the vision of sallies from this position into every domain of the social world impel a fresh assault. The final defenses of libertarianism are before us to give us pause. There is the argument of instinct and the argument of evolution.

We are shown the child in his cradle. John Behaviorism Watson picks him up and he struggles to be free. Free! But let his mother pick him up and the infant is content to be fed, protected, and governed. The desire for autonomy may be one of the strongest impulses in human nature and one of the earliest manifested. But equally manifest is the desire for protection, for regulation. To consider one of these impulses rather than the other as the index of life's values demonstrates a personal preference, but not the validity of that preference.

The argument that mankind is tending towards the goal of individual freedom would not, if it were true, show that goal to be valuable. History makes facts but it does not make them good. The argument, however, is not even true. The history of man has shown that not only do men create institutions which bind them, "shackles which hamper the growth of their own spirits," but they live under them willingly.

There is no doubt that the modern tendency, (not very obvious, one must admit, in this country), is towards socialization. And that socialization is incompatible with the individualism which is summed up in the phrase, "Let each do as he pleases." All social control is definitely an attempt to hasten the decay of "individualism," a substitution of the vision of individuals in a society for that of individuals in separate cells.

Against all the arguments for freedom one reply is sufficient. Apart from the obvious value of restraint for those whose injury is prevented, the value which restraint has for those who are restrained is enough to invalidate any theory which sets up freedom as man's highest good. It is a fact too basic to be obscured by bigoted and exaggerated statement, that every valuable realm of human conduct demands a certain discipline, a certain narrowness, in short a definite system of restraints, which are usually too complicated for the individual to invent and too inscrutable for him to accept unless he is governed by that set of social pressures we call culture. Without such infringements upon liberty the human soul would be a formless and powerless liquid. Man's need and desire for the regulation of his conduct by accepted authorities is the most fundamental fact to be observed in all his associations,—in church, state, university, and the lesser organizations of industry and social intercourse,—as well in his requests for advice in matters of etiquette and affairs of the heart, and in his search for knowledge, the fruit of others' thoughts.

Education, despite the programs of experimental schools, cannot be divorced from authority. It is, essentially, the process by which the heritage of the past is transmitted to the future through the brutes of the present. Where authority is held in low esteem, and is yet the very basis of an institution, there is the danger that, through lack of discrimination, we shall replace one set of authorities by controlling forces far more pernicious. The fashionable belief that it is unnecessary to teach facts, (since they are all listed in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*), provided only we teach habits of thought is, like all applications of libertarianism, essentially self-contradictory. Habits of thought are themselves simply responses to facts of some importance or generality. These facts must be planted in the growing mind if it is ever to bloom and bear fruit. The responsibility which this planting devolves upon the educator is only the less carefully met when its nature is ignored.

Nor is education alone in this precarious state. Any one who has the courage to visit exhibits of modern art feels that here too the revolt against discipline has destroyed the most significant values of expression.

The philosophy of laissez faire, buried fifty years ago with all decent formalities, has been exhumed by a comfortable, tired, and somewhat perplexed generation, to serve as a philosophical apology for moral lassitude. But in turn, this philosophy is robbing a newer generation of taste, discrimination, and moral vigor. Unable to pierce the hollow mockery of a high-sounding ideal, and equally unable to bring within its framework the moral needs of the world, we have forgotten that economic freedom is to be attained only by imposing government upon property owners, that freedom from war can be secured only by putting force above the force of nations, that liberty of thought is to be achieved only by the suppression of prejudice and ignorance—in short, that there is no magic in goodness, and that when the good renounce Power, the bad must rule the earth. To have sacrificed upon the altar of freedom youth's immemorial heritage, the right to reform the world, is the crowning sin and misfortune of our age.

F. S. Cohen
L. M. Kramer

Sir: I have read with interest Mr. Cohen's reply to my articles on freedom. I am sorry that he seems to have got a very poor idea of what I was driving at. That is my fault, perhaps. Such of his arguments as bear on the points I discussed are already answered fully enough, I think, in the articles themselves. For the rest, our difference is one of opinion, save for one or two points on which Mr. Cohen, having misunderstood me, unintentionally misrepresents me. For example, he implies that I am out against discipline, and proceeds to remark that want of discipline has produced lamentable results in education and the arts. I think he will find no word in any of the articles to support this implication. I have said a good deal against *regulation;* but I have never even hinted, so far as I am aware, that freedom must necessarily preclude that self-discipline without which very little can be achieved either in life or in art. I am, etc.,

Suzanne La Follette.

Charles H. Ingersoll, maker of the dollar pen, picked up THE ARBITRATOR to cure his insomnia. Instead, it waked him up and he wrote: "I am writing to impress you with the quality of your work as a liberal writer. . . . I am confirmed in the opinion that your stuff is pre-eminent, and I hope I know the meaning of that word."

60 Cents a Year

114 East 31st Street New York City

Organizations • Periodicals • Schools

ORGANIZATIONS

FREE SPEECH IN ALL ITS PHASES
Write
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

COMMITTEE ON MILITARISM IN EDUCATION—Opposes military training by the War Department in civilian colleges, including compulsory training, and training in high schools. Literature sent on request. Address 387 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City.

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY—Promotes a better understanding of problems of democracy in industry through its pamphlet, research and lecture services and organization of college and city groups. Executive Directors, Harry W. Laidler and Norman Thomas, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

THE YOUTH SECTION OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION is a group of young men and women, who, believing in the oneness of the human family seek to express the principles of Jesus in regard to War, Race, Industry and other human relationships. For Literature write: Youth Section, F. O. R., 386 Bible House, Astor Place, New York City.

PREVENTION OF WAR LITERATURE—Apply to the National Council for Prevention of War, 532 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

ETHICAL SOCIETIES. PUBLIC SUNDAY MEETINGS AT 11 A. M., with Live Addresses on Moral Issues of the Day. No dogma; no religious test for fellowship. Boston. Repertory Hall. Brooklyn: Academy of Music. Chicago: Studebaker Theatre. New York: Meeting House, Central Park West and 64th Street. Philadelphia: Academy of Music. St. ouis: Sheldon Memorial, 3648 Washington Boulevard. Students specially welcome. GIVE YOUR LIFE A MORAL PURPOSE! Information and specimen of our magazine, THE STANDARD, from American Ethical Union, 2 W. 64th Street, New York.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION LEAGUE—311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, furnishes information and speakers on "P. R.", the new method of election used in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Ireland, etc., which is designed to make popular government a reality.

THE COSMOPOLITAN STUDENT

A quarterly magazine devoted to the activities of the foreign student in the Universities and Colleges of America. The official organ of The Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs of America.
$1.00 per year.

J. MARSHALL McWILLIAMS
EDITOR

2545 BENVENUE AVENUE
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM—U. S. Headquarters, 522 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. An International Organization with 25 National Sections pursuing a common program to end war through world organization for social, political and economic cooperation. International President, Jane Addams; National President, Emily Balch Greene; Executive Secretary, Dorothy Detzer.

YOUNG POALE ZION, 32 Union Square, N. Y. C., organizes the liberal elements in American Jewish Youth on behalf of pro-labor policies and creates a sympathetic understanding in America for the Jewish nationalist socialist movement in Palestine. Official publication, "YUGNT."

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE—Improves child labor legislation; conducts investigation in local communities; advises on administration; furnishes information. Supplies leaflets, posters and plays for free distribution and reasonably priced pamphlets on various aspects of child labor. 215 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

WORKERS' EDUCATION BUREAU OF AMERICA—A cooperative EDUCATIONAL AGENCY for the promotion of ADULT EDUCATION among INDUSTRIAL WORKERS, 476 West 24th Street, New York City. Spencer Miller, Jr., Sec'y.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, a nation-wide, nonpartisan organization for arousing in American citizens an intelligent and influential interest in their government. New Voters' Units in colleges and normal schools. New York office: 821 Graybar Building, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE (Quakers)—special fields: International, Interracial, Peace, Patriotic Service. Address the Secretary, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PERIODICALS

THE NATION—A weekly review of significant news. Prints more college news than any other political weekly. Contains distinguished literary reviews and dramatic criticism. $5.00 per year. $2.50 for six months. Special class rates on request. 20 Vesey Street, New York.

LABOR AGE, The National Monthly, presents the answer to the challenge of Reaction, and stimulates the workers to fight against the fraud and fakery of the Newer Capitalism. Trial 6-monthly subscription, $1. 3 West 16th Street, New York City.

NEW MASSES—Editor—Michael Gold. A radical monthly of art and literature. Published by a group of some of the most brilliant writers and artists in America. One of its purposes is to reveal the talented work of unknown young writers and artists. $1.50 a year: special trial subscription rate to students $1.00 for seven months. 39 Union Square, New York City.

THE INTERCOLLEGIAN
347 Madison Avenue, New York
News, Reviews, Articles, Forums on matters of concern to the Student Christian Movement. Monthly, October to June. Single subscriptions, 1.25; in clubs of five, $1.

THE DAILY WORKER, the only fighting daily labor paper in America. Read about our campaign against injunctions—unemployment—company unions—persecution of the foreign born—the new World War in the making and the campaigns for organization of the unorganized. Recognition and Defense of the Soviet Union—Miners' Relief and a Labor Party. Three months trial subscription $2.00. 26-28 Union Square, New York City.

SCHOOLS

THE MODERN SCHOOL
STELTON, N. J.
A Co-educational School for Children where the Key-note of Learning is the Freedom of Self-Expression in Creative Activities with a Social Environment Developing Responsibility and Comradeship. Boarding Dept.
Write for Catalogue. Jas. H. Dick, Prin.

To College Classes

from 1926 to 1930

TO FIND OUT first-hand what kind of college students would like to go to, and to encourage thinking and writing about standards of academic life, The New Republic is inviting the older students and younger graduates of American colleges to submit articles on the subject:

College As It Might Be

These articles will be considered under the following conditions:

1. Members of the college classes from 1930—the present juniors—back to 1926 may submit essays.
2. Each essay must be not more than 2,000 words long.
3. It must be received in the office of The New Republic on or before April 1, 1929.
4. The name, class, college, home address, and, in the case of alumni, the present occupation of the author must appear on every manuscript.
5. Articles will be judged by the following committee:

   Alexander Meiklejohn of the University of Wisconsin, author of "The Liberal College."

   Max McConn of Lehigh University, author of "College or Kindergarten?"

   Robert Morss Lovett of the University of Chicago and The New Republic.

6. The writer of the best article will receive the sum of $100, and his essay will be published in The New Republic, if possible before the close of the academic year.
7. The writer of the next best article in the opinion of the judges will receive $75.
8. The editors reserve the privilege of summarizing or extracting points from other articles, or of buying them at regular rates for publication.
9. Articles should be addressed to College Essay Editor,

THE NEW REPUBLIC
421 West 21st Street, New York City

Among the points which essays might consider are the following:

Location of the college: city or country?

Size: the best number of students.

Selection of students.

Curriculum: proportion of electives, degree of specialization.

Method of instruction: quizzes, lectures, seminars.

Examinations; grades.

Intellectual life of individuals and groups.

Living quarters; fraternities.

Co-education.

Athletics and other organized activities.

Advantages of the writer's own college, and how these could be developed.

THE NEW REPUBLIC,
421 West 21st Street,
New York.

For enclosed $2.50 kindly send The New Republic for six months and the book,

Impressions of Soviet Russia,
by John Dewey
or
College or Kindergarten?
by Max McConn

name .....

address .....

in full .....

N.S. 2-29